From hindi to urdu

A Social and Political History

TARIQ RAHMAN

From Hindi to Urdu

A Social and Political History

From Hindi to Urdu
A Social and Political History

Tariq Rahman

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

DEDICATED TO
Wife, companion and friend of thirty years
HANA
And children
Son-in-law Atif, daughter Tania and son Fahad

لوگوں کوں جب کھول بتاویں

ہندی میں کہہ کر سمجھاویں

Lōgõ kõ jab khōl batāvẽ

Hindī mẽ kaēh kar samjhavẽ

(When they explain clearly to the people

It is in Hindi that they speak to make them understand)

Tarīkh-ē-Gharībī, 1170 Hijri/1756–57

وہ اردو کیا ہے یہ ہندی زباں ہے

کہ جس کا قائل اب سارا جہاں ہے

Vo Urdū kyā haē yē Hindī zubã haē

Ke jis ka qā'el ab sarā jahã haē

(What that 'Urdu'? It is the Hindi language

Which now the whole world acknowledges)

Pir Murad Shah 1203/1788–89

Contents

Preface and Acknowledgements

This book has taken me to some of the major cities of Pakistan including Karachi and Lahore and four countries: England, France, Germany, and India. It made me learn the Devanagari script on my own and Persian from the Khana-e-Farhang in Rawalpindi at the age of fifty-eight. It made me study sources in Urdu, Persian, Pashto, and Hindi and even get works in Chaghtai Turkish, French and German translated for myself. In short, in about five years of fairly intensive and extensive study, it took me to hitherto uncharted intellectual regions making me almost give up in despair and regret that I had bitten more than I could chew. Indeed, I had no idea of what kind of work this book would entail otherwise I might never have started it in the first place.

The book began in September 2005 although I had started thinking about it during my stay at the University of California, Berkeley as the first incumbent of the Pakistan Chair in 2004–05. This was a period of growth in the universities of Pakistan and the Higher Education Commission (HEC), presided over by Dr Atta ur Rahman, was flush with money and encouraged academics to submit research proposals. As I had never received any funding before, except airfare once in 1993 from the University Grants Commission, I had no hopes of getting funding for the project of writing a social history of Urdu. However, I applied. And, in two years, I did get funding for which I am most grateful to the HEC. But the story of how this funding came through, is instructive, if for no other reason than to make donors change their ways. Briefly, my experience was excellent as far as the top leadership of the HEC is concerned but very painful as far as the middle-ranking bureaucracy is concerned. Let me elaborate.

Firstly, the middle-level officials of the HEC regretted that they had no allocations for books. Projects—yes; books—no! Upon this, I resubmitted the proposal as a project. Secondly, I applied for something more than Rs 700,000 and got Rs 400,000. As it happened, the expenditure, not counting the money I got for fellowships at Oxford and Heidelberg, came to something close to Rs 750,000 so that all the expenditure, over and above the money from the HEC, came out of the family savings. Thirdly, and most importantly, it took two years for the funds to be released. Even this delay could be endured because of bureaucratic red-tapism but the strange demands upon me, which are described below, were unendurable. For instance, one referee declared that I was working like Don Quixote and that such a history should be written in collaboration with such institutions as the National Language Authority. Moreover, said the same sage, there was no need for me to go to India or England. The material was all available in Pakistan. From this I guessed that the writer of the report was a scholar of Urdu literature who had no idea that most of the reports, private papers of British officers and other sources necessary for writing a sociolinguistic and political history of Urdu were scattered over Indian and British archives. Later, of course, I discovered that they were also in other European countries.

The referee also insisted that the 'project' be finished in one year or a maximum of two and the HEC officials added that the product should be published by them. I had to turn down both conditions. The book would take five or six years I told them and, as HEC could not distribute the books as well as an academic press, nor did it command prestige as a publisher, I would try my luck with a prestigious academic press once it was over. I did, of course, agree that they could stop their funding after two years or whenever they wished but the book would go on. After several such acerbic exchanges, possibly because of my complaints about delay and no response to letters, the HEC told

me that the project could not be funded. It was now that I made a personal appeal to Dr Sohail Naqvi and I thank him most sincerely for having intervened and got the funds released—though, regrettably, after a reduction of nearly Rs300,000.

Anyway, during the two years of wrangling with the HEC, I kept collecting research material and reading. The National Documentation Centre in the Cabinet Division in Islamabad had some very useful material as did the Punjab University Library and the Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu in Karachi. However, I had to see the material in the British Library in London. As personal savings were not adequate the only option was to stay with friends—Dr Rashid and Dr Ghazala Bhatti—in Oxford and travel daily on the Oxford Tube (the name of a long-distance bus which they call a 'coach' in England) to London. So this is what I decided to do and, as a gamble, requested the Oxford University Press for the return ticket to England. Much to my surprise—since I had made clear I might never write the book after all—Mrs Ameena Saiyid sent me money for the ticket. Even more surprisingly, the price of the ticket came down (yes, they do sometimes) and when I offered to return the leftover money she very graciously told me to use it for research.

But, of course, the money for travelling, photocopying and occasional meals etc., came from the family savings. The under-standing was that when these Rs 100,000 (about £700) come to an end I would return to Pakistan. Well, they came to an end just when I had figured out what to look for in the Oriental and India Office Collections of the British Library in London. At the Bodleian I spent only a week and barely touched the surface so to speak.

Then came the trip to India in January 2008. By then the money from the HEC had come in so, for once, the trip was comfortable and I am grateful to the donors for it. I am also grateful to the Indian embassy which gave me a non-police reporting visa of six cities. I found excellent research material

at the Nehru Memorial Library in Delhi, the Aligarh Muslim University Library, the Rampur Raza Library, and above all, the Andhra Pradesh Archives in Hyderabad. I cannot find words to thank Tanmoy Roychoudhary and Ketaki Bose of the Orient Blackswan Press, my publishers in India, for their warm hospitality and logistic support. I also thank Professor Ravinder Gargesh, then in charge of the Delhi University Guest House, for having made our stay (my wife Rehana and daughter, Tania accompanied me) a real pleasure. So I returned from India with loads of research material and very warm memories.

The HEC funding, inadequate as it was, came to an end by 2008 but luckily a great breakthrough occurred. I was given a fellowship at the Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies for the Trinity Term (18 January to 15 March 2010). This was the first time I really discovered the riches of the Bodleian Library. Indeed, there was such an abundance of research material that I did not undertake the daily journey to London on the Oxford Tube which had exhausted me so much in July 2006. But for this stay at Oxford, this book would be inadequate and weak. I, therefore, thank the Director of the Centre, Dr Farhan Nizami, and the committee which awarded me this fellowship for this significant contribution to my research. I also thank Mrs Nighat Malik and my friend Dr Iftikhar Malik for being such good neighbours and entertaining friends during our stay at Oxford. Indeed, if Mrs Malik had not given us a flat belonging to Worcester College my wife and I would have been on the streets. At Oxford, I must thank Dr Adeel Malik and Dr Talib who put in a lot of colour in that unusually chilly Oxford winter. Of course, my old friend Chandramohan, as usual, stands out for having given us the warm hospitality of his house and very pleasant company at Oxford, Canterbury and London. Our other friends of my student days—Riaz, Laiqa, Dave, and Billy—also met us and made us feel wonderful. And, above all, our daughter Tania and her husband Atif visited us and we visited them. Indeed, I thank Atif and his

family for providing us a second home in England. In short, there was much fun being in England with my wife as in the old days when we had set up our first house after marriage in 1982.

After Oxford the book had taken shape but I knew Germany had some manuscripts of Urdu I had not seen. So I applied for and got a research fellowship from DAAD tenable at the University of Heidelberg. The fellowships are for longer periods but I had requested them to reduce it to a month because I was in a hurry to finish the book and I thought Germany would not have much material beyond the manuscripts. But Lo and Behold! The South Asia Centre at Heidelberg had material which amazed me. So, instead of looking leisurely at a few manuscripts, I worked hard for a month and so the book—despite its inadequacies—finally came to an end in August 2010, i.e. five years after it began.

I take this opportunity to thank people who either helped me find research material or let me use their libraries. First, our extremely competent librarian at the National Institute of Pakistan Studies, Mr Tahir Naqvi, who miraculously procured almost every rare book I asked for; then Dr Shahid Kamal for sending me some rare books from Karachi and helping me find material in the library of the University of Karachi; Dr Saleem Mazhar, Director of the Centre for South Asian Studies at the Punjab University, gave me his own work in Persian on Khan-e-Arzu and helped me find very useful material from the Shirani Collection of the Punjab University, Lahore; Dr Hanif Khalil, Assistant Professor of Pashto at NIPS, who found some rare Pashto works for me. Professor Fateh Mohammad Malik and Iftikhar Arif who generously gave me material on Urdu from the National Language Authority and allowed me to use the library.

I now come to translators: my greatest debt is to Dr Jawad Hamadani who actually spent hours teaching me some of the relevant Persian classics and then checked my translations for

correctness; Dr Hanif Khalil who translated some lines from Pashto and checked my translations of other lines; Mr Harun Koken who checked lines from the autobiography of Babar in Chaghtai Turkish; Dr Vaishna Narang who transliterated lines from Old Hindi, Dr Anand Mishra who translated them for me and Gautam Liu who wrote them for me in the Devanagari script in Heidelberg. I also thank my colleague, Dr Azam Chaudhary, for translating background material for me from German to English. But for these translators the book would not have been completed.

The book was word-processed by Mr Yousaf Khan, my part-time secretary, who has worked loyally with me for the past ten years. I owe him a debt of gratitude for his hard work and patience as the book took shape over the last five years. I also thank the Oxford University Press, especially Mrs Ameena Saiyid, its Managing Director, who published the book and especially for permitting Orient Blackswan for publishing it in India. I especially thank Miss Manal Shakir for her efficient editing of the book. I am also grateful to all the unknown and silent workers in the press who brought the book into being.

In the end I would like to thank my family for their cooperation and appreciation of my work. Tania for having made me addicted to India soap operas which enabled me to write about their language. Fahad for encouraging me in various ways, including his insistence that I actually enjoyed studying and writing and that this could hardly be normal. And above all, my wife Hana, but for whom the book could never have been completed. For it was not only the extra money which she never grudged me for this hobby but the emotional support and the constant reassurance that I could finish it and that I need not give up.

After the painful experience with funding this time I intend not to rely on donors. I used to write as a hobby with my savings and this is what I intend to do again. Of course, ones' savings are never enough for a big project but I am at the fag end of my

research career and I do not intend to compromise my self-respect by submitting a proposal unless the donor is one who can give funding with respect and without inordinate delay. Obviously that is not the way to create a research culture in the country but that is something academic managers and donors should bother about.

FUNDING FOR THE BOOK

Head of Expenditure	Donor	Amount
Air ticket (July 2006) to the UK and back	Oxford University Press	Rs67,000
Trip to India and research Pakistan (2 years)	Higher Education Commission	Rs430,043
One-term stay at Oxford	Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies University of Oxford.	£4,000
One-month stay at the University of Heidelberg	DAAD	€2,820
NB: Expenses out of personal income, such as the first stay in England in July 2006, the ticket for the trip to Oxford in 2010, photocopying, secretarial assistance for five years etc has not been calculated but comes roughly to Rs 350,000. At this time Rs 85 is equivalent to 1 USD.		

Abbreviations

A	Arabic (derived ultimately from the Arabic language)
AA	Andhra Archives, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh, India
AH	Al-Hijra (Islamic calendar). Where there are two dates the one which comes before the slashes is this whereas that after the slash is the Common Era date, i.e. AH/CE
AU	*Akhbar-e-Urdu*, Islamabad: National Language Authority
AUS	*Annual of Urdu Studies*
Bod	Bodleian Library, University of Oxford
c.	Circa
F	Farsi (derived from the Persian language)
H	Hindi (derived from Sanskrit or one of the varieties of the greater Hindi language)
Hdl	Library of the University of Heidelberg, Germany
IOR	India Office Records (dates, numbers of documents, etc., are parenthetically embedded in the text)
KP	Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (new name for former North West Frontier Province)
LAD-B	Legislative Assembly Debates of East Bengal (the exact references are given parenthetically in the text)
n.d.	No date
NDC	National Documentation Centre, Cabinet Division, Islamabad
NLA	National Language Authority (*Muqtadrā Qaumī Zubān*)
n.pag.	No pagination
OIOC	Oriental and India Office Collections, the British Library, London
PO	*Pakistan Observer* [English daily from Dhaka]
Punj	Punjabi language (derived from or found now in Punjabi)

PBUH   'Peace Be Upon Him)—used by Muslims for respect
        towards Prophet Muhammad
RRL   Rampur Raza Library, Rampur, UP, India

Translation and Transliteration

Translations from several languages—Turkish, Sanskritized Hindi, Arabic, and Pashto—were made by translators. The passages from Persian, Punjabi, Siraiki, spoken Hindi in the Devanagari script, and Urdu were translated by the author unless otherwise indicated. Most, except Urdu, were shown for verification to people competent in these languages and scripts.

The pronunciation of Persian and Arabic texts is that of Urdu speakers and not that of Iranians or Arabs. As the primary readership of this book is of scholars of South Asia, familiar words and names of persons and places have been transliterated using ordinary Roman letters unless the pronunciation is considered ambiguous or unfamiliar. Titles of books and quotations have, however, been transliterated using the symbols given below.

Symbols commonly used for Urdu, Hindi and Persian sounds. The Urdu pronunciation is used even if the letters (graphemes) are borrowed from Arabic or Persian.

Ā   as in ask (nasalized as ã).

Ē   as in Urdu/pet/=stomach (half high front vowel) (ẽ nasalized).

Ī   as in s<u>ea</u>t (ĩ nasalized).

Ō   as in Urdu/log/=people (half high back vowel) (õ nasalized).

Ū   as in b<u>oo</u>t (ũ nasalized).

<u>Kh</u>   as in Scottish lo<u>ch</u>/lox/(خ)

<u>gh</u>   as in Af<u>gh</u>anistan (velar fricative/ɣ/or غ)

z	ض	ز	ذ	ظ	(/z/voiced alveolar fricative)
s	ث	ص	س		(/s/unvoiced alveolar fricative)
q	ق				(/q/unvoiced uvular stop)
t	ت	ط			(/ṯ/unvoiced dental stop)

Symbols used for retroflex sounds in South Asian Languages

ڑ	ṛ	ڑھ	ṛh
ڈ	ḍ	ڈھ	ḍh
ٹ	ṭ	ٹھ	ṭh

Symbols used for Arabic Sounds

- و As a Persian/Urdu conjunction is transliterated as (-o) whereas as an Arabic conjunction و is transliterated as (wa).

- ' as in Arabic pronunciation of 'Ali (glottal stop). This is used to show orthography

- ' *hamza* ء (in Arabic it represents the glottal stop and is used for the pause between two vowels. Its use varies according to its position, i.e. initial, medial and final. For South Asian speakers of Urdu and other languages it functions like a vowel i.e. schwa or/ə/). This is not used except in quotations.

Usage of Oriental Words in this book

Words commonly used in contemporary writings in English are written without the use of the orthographical symbols given in this chart unless they are in a quotation or part of a title.

Examples are:

Word	Usage in this book
'ālim	alim
'ulemā	ulema
Bhāshā	Bhasha
ghazal	ghazal
Hadīth	Hadis
Hindī	Hindi
Jihād	jihad
Kharī Bōlī	Khari Boli
madrassā	madrassa
Maōlvī	Maulvi
Maulānā	Maulana
Munshī	Munshi
Qur'ān	Quran
Rēkhtā	Rekhta
Sāhib	Sahib
Sūfī	Sufi
Urdū	Urdu

1

Introduction

From the thirteenth till the end of the eighteenth century the name of the language we now call Urdu was mostly Hindi. Other names were also used (see Chapter 2) but this was the name which most people used for this language. But then it was not *this* language. Firstly, because languages change naturally. And, secondly, because the language mostly called Hindi for about five hundred years was the ancestor of two languages: modern Urdu and Hindi. Modern Urdu was created not only by natural change but also human agency as, indeed, was modern Hindi. This book narrates the story of how this happened. And this narrative unfolds by tracing out the use of Urdu in social domains: education, courts, administration, entertainment, media, religion, and so on. That is why it is a social history and, since all these uses feed into politics, it is also a political history of Urdu.

At present Urdu is the national language of Pakistan, a symbol of Muslim identity in (north) India and a widely spoken language among the South Asian diaspora spread all over the world. In its spoken form it is so similar to spoken Hindi that, in fact, it has far more second-language users than the numbers of its mother-tongue speakers would suggest. Here is what the *Ethnologue* tells us:

Speakers of Conversational Urdu/Hindi		
	Mother Tongue Speakers	**Second Language Speakers**
Hindi	366,000,000	487,000,000
Urdu	60,290,000	104,000,000
Total	426,290,000	591,000,000
Grand Total: Mother tongue + second language speakers of Urdu-Hindi = 1,017,290,000.		
Source: Gordon 2005: see under 'Pakistan' and 'India' entries.		

Mother tongue speakers of Urdu are about 7.4 per cent of the total population of Pakistan (Census-P 2001) while mother tongue speakers of Hindi are 41.03 per cent and those of Urdu 5.01 per cent of the population of India (Census-I 2001: Statement-4, p. 13).

The spoken form, which is popularized by Bollywood and Indian and Pakistani TV plays and songs, can be heard on the streets of Delhi, Karachi, Lahore, and even Dubai. And Hindi films are available in Afghanistan, UK, USA, Zambia, Botswana, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, and Fiji. It is also taught, both in the Urdu and the Hindi varieties, in major universities of the world. And coming down to the level of the common people, it is the most preferred language of inscriptions in Pakistan. About 75 per cent of the inscriptions on Pakistani trucks, plying day and night all over the roads of Pakistan, from Karachi to Kabul, Quetta to Lahore and Gilgit to the Neelam Valley, are in Urdu. Even Pashto, the language of most of the drivers of these trucks, is used only on 14 per cent of them while Punjabi, otherwise the language of 44.15 per cent of Pakistanis, is used only on 10 per cent of trucks; Sindhi, with 14.10 per cent mother-tongue speakers, has a paltry share of 1 per cent as far as inscriptions on trucks are concerned. Balochi and Brahvi are found with great effort and percentages cannot be calculated (Rahman 2010: 277). In short, if the choice of language to write inscriptions is an

indicator of the dissemination of Urdu, then it is certainly the most widespread language of Pakistan among ordinary people connected with business activities especially in the transportation sector.

And, while much more widespread because of the modern means of communications than ever before, some variety of this language has been a lingua franca over much of the subcontinent, longer than any other language. For instance, a Marathi document informs us that the runners and news-gatherers (*harkārās*) in eighteenth century Maratha kingdoms were supposed to know five languages, one of which was 'Avidhi'—one of the dialects of 'Hindi' and possibly the name given to the commonly used variety of the languages of the Hindi belt used in Maharashtra (Quoted from Bayly 1996: 64). And, earlier literature from Gujarat, the Deccan, and even from the Punjab and what is now northern Pakistan, bear witness to the wide area over which unstandardised, mutually intelligible varieties of a language, which can be called 'Hindi-Urdu', were spread out unevenly even before the British spread the standardized varieties systematically.

At present the names of this ancient language are Urdu and Hindi. However, the term 'Hindustani'—used mostly by the British for this language—is still used for the spoken language of the popular, urban culture of North India and Pakistan. George Grierson, the pioneer of the modern scientific study of the languages of South Asia, defines these terms as follows:

> Hindōstānī is primarily the language of the Upper Gangetic Doab, and is also the *lingua franca* of India, capable of being written in both Persian and Dēvanāgarī characters, and without purism, avoiding alike the excessive use of either Persian or Sanskrit words when employed for literature. The name 'Urdu' can then be confined to that special variety of Hindōstānī in which Persian words are of frequent occurrence, and which hence can only be written in the Persian character, and, similarly, 'Hindi' can be confined to the form

of Hindōstānī in which Sanskrit words abound, and which hence can
only be written in the Dēvanāgarī character (Grierson Vol. 3: 47).

These definitions, coming from the British period, are as valid
today as they were in the early twentieth century. However, the
term Hindustani is not used much in either India or Pakistan.
That was the middle ground which has been lost, and what has
replaced it are the names for the opposite ends of the continuum:
Hindi and Urdu. These standardized varieties, Sanskritized Hindi
and Perso-Arabicised Urdu, diverge so much from each other at
the higher, more learned, levels that they are almost unintelligible
for the speakers of the other variety. That is why modern Urdu
and Hindi are considered different languages even by linguistic
historians (Rai 1984: 288; Jain 2005: 259) who describe their
common ancestry.

Both the standardized varieties, like all other big languages,
are actually made up of area-bound (dialects) or class-bound
(sociolects) varieties as well as styles and registers. Thus the
term Hindi is also used for the sum total of its varieties which
are fifty, excluding the term 'Hindi' itself, in the Census of 2001.
Out of these the major dialects are: Bhojpuri (33,099,497
speakers); Chattisgarhi (13,260,186); Magadhi (13,978,565);
Rajasthani (18,355,613); Mewari (5,091,697); Bundeli (3,072,147);
Awadhi (2,529,308); Marwari (7,936,183); and Khortha (4,725,927)
(Census-I 2001: Statement-1, part-A, p. 3). And Urdu has Dakhini,
Lakhnawi Urdu, Dehlavi, Bambayya Urdu, Pakistani Urdu, and
several sub-varieties of the language (some described in Grierson
Vol. 3). Thus, what one means when one uses the words Urdu or
Hindi, varies from context to context and speaker to speaker.

In this book the term Urdu will be used for that variety of
Hindustani (in Grierson's meaning of the word) which is written
in the Perso-Arabic script and the learned and formal registers
of which borrow terms from Persian and Arabic. The terms
Hindi-Urdu (or Urdu-Hindi) will be used for the ancestor of

modern Hindi and Urdu which went by several names, which will be mentioned later. It is also used for the language shared between urban Pakistan and North India—indeed, all major cities of South Asia—which goes by the name of 'Hindi' in the Bollywood films but used to be called 'Hindustani' before 1947. In my view, because it eschews difficult words from Persian, Arabic and Sanskrit, it is closer to the real, living speech of urban people in North India and Pakistan. It does, of course, have words of Sanskritic and Perso-Arabic origin but these have been nativized and assimilated in the language for centuries. A list of 5,500 such words, based on the existing dictionaries of Urdu, Hindi and Hindustani is available thanks to the scholarly work of Agnieszka kuczkiewicz-Fras (2008), which illustrates how deeply these words have penetrated the ancestor of our languages and how indispensable they have become. Indeed, they are part of the common language of North Indian and Pakistani cities. It is the language we hear in the soap operas of India and Pakistan and the lilting strains of music South Asians love, whether in the semi-desert expanses of Rajasthan and Bahawalpur or the marriage halls of Houston, Bradford and London.

This book is a social history of Urdu including Urdu-Hindi in both its meanings. Despite Shamsur Rahman Faruqi's warning that the term 'Old Urdu' is linguistically and historically incorrect (Faruqi 1999: 11), it is a convenient term to use for the variety of language which evolved into modern Urdu and Hindi. Of course it was called Hindvi and Hindi and by other names but this term (Old Urdu) will be used sometimes if it helps us in understanding certain developments.

But, first things first, 'what is a social history'? Is it the description of the reflection of society in literary works? If so, the poetic genre called *shahr ashōb* in Urdu would be an excellent way of writing such a history. These poems record the devastation and decline of cities and the civilization which was associated with them (Aqil 2008: 72–73). One could also record the political

response to the events of 1857—called the mutiny till nationalist historiography started calling it 'the war of independence', sometime from 1910 onwards. See Rahman 2009—or the effect of nationalism or the freedom movement on Urdu literature. This kind of work has already been done by Moinuddin Aqil in *Taēhrīk-ē -Azādī Mē Urdū kā Hissā* (2008). But the present work is not a history of Urdu literature; it is a social and political history of the language. By social history I mean a historical reconstruction of the events and processes which preceded and led to the use of Urdu in such social domains as governance, judiciary, education, media, and entertainment. But mere chronological recording of events and processes is only one aspect of this undertaking. More importantly I will attempt to understand the effects of the use of Urdu in the domains mentioned above. All such uses had important effects upon the construction and perception of identity, political mobilization and the distribution of goods and services. In short, the historical narrative is not a mere record of facts and perceptions. It is meant to be a nuanced analysis of what happens when a language is used in certain social domains. The reality which emerges is so complex as to defy any neat categorization or analysis in terms of relationships between variables. What one can hope for is to find tentative answers to the following questions.

What ideological and political purposes do theories about the origin and age of the language serve? What is its identity? Is it a Muslim language or the product of the composite culture of the Hindus and Muslims of North India? Is it the language of romantic love and eroticism? Or is it the language of Islam and right-wing political ideologues? How did it replace Persian as the official language of the princely states of India? How was it used in the domains of education, media and film?

There are many scholars who have attempted to answer questions about the origins (Shirani 1930; Malik et al., 2006), names (Faruqi 1999: 11–38 and 2003: 805–812; Shirani 1926 in

1965: 1–9;) and linguistic reform of Urdu (Bilgrami 1884) and the association of the language with Islam and erotica. But this book is not so much interested in answering these questions for themselves. Rather, these questions will be answered with reference to social and political factors: the construction of identity, especially Muslim identity, and its political repercussions. For instance, the antiquity and origin of Urdu relate to its identity (essence) as a composite legacy of the Hindu and Muslim civilization of North India or, alternatively, as a Muslim preserve. Standardization also relates to the same perceptions about the identity of the language. The identity of the language, in turn, feeds into notions about the identity of its users. They may be seen as being Muslim', 'Pakistani nationalist' or 'urban' at different periods of history. Whether the amorous and erotic associations of Urdu are suppressed or not depends upon which identity perception of its users is favoured. Similarly, the use of Urdu in social domains mentioned above is closely related to the formation of Hindu and Muslim communal identities and their struggle for supremacy during the British period.

This study is not limited to any specific period but the focus being the use of Urdu in social domains, especially when modernity impinged upon the subcontinent, there is more emphasis upon British India than upon medieval or post-partition South Asia. This is especially useful because the relationship of Urdu with identity-formation and its political repercussions developed during this period and we are still experiencing the effects.

While the field of social history is a familiar one—there being classical studies of the social history of England (Trevelyan 1942), the formation of the British working class (Thompson 1963) and the whole subaltern school of Indian history (Guha 1981–9)—the present author has come across only a few books purporting to be social histories of language in the sense that they focus on the use of language in social domains. Burke and Porter's edited book

with that title, *The Social History of Language* (1987), is meant to fill the 'gap between linguistics, sociology (including social anthropology) and history, a gap which can and should be filled by the social historian of language' (Burke and Porter 1987: 1). But the main contributions to this book are on the use of language in society such as insults, etc. Other social or cultural histories of languages are also concerned with the interests of sociolinguists: standardization, the deployment of prestigious features in conversation (pronunciation), varieties of language, social class, and language, etc. In a cultural history of English, Knowles raises such 'issues as languages in contact, the development of literacy and new text types, and the relationship between standard language and dialects' (Knowles 1979: 1). In another cultural history of English, Bailey traces out the history of the standardization of the language and such things as 'myths about its correct use' (Bailey 1992). One book purporting itself to be the social history of American English is a study of the development of the varieties of American English. While it refers to the influence of immigration, transportation (railroads) and the rough living of the frontier (gambling, drinking, etc.), the focus remains the lexicon or other linguistic features. There is little reference to the social processes and institutions which use language and how other non-linguistic features like identity, ideology and economy, etc., are related to it (Dillard 1985). However, another book entitled *A Social History of English* (Leith 1983), is indeed a history of the changing patterns of the use of the language, its imposition and spread and its standardization and role in the world. These are some of the grounds the present study covers but, since it is also a political study, it tilts towards the political repercussions of such phenomena. Even more than Dick Leith, Knowles covers ground which is intended to be covered in this book. He looks at the role of printing and the role of English as a language of opposition to church and state in the

fourteenth century (Knowles 1979: 63–65). These are concerns which inform this book.

Of course the number of studies on the use of a language in one or more domains of a society are legion. An exemplar is Nicholas Ostler's *Empires of the Word* (2005). The author traces out languages which spread over vast areas and influenced a large number of people. The approach is that of macro-history though the author does not use that term. Speaking about the analytical category of language he says:

> The language point of view on history can be contrasted with the genetic approach to human history, which is currently revolutionising our view of our distant past. Like membership in a biological species and a matrilineal lineage if its mother is in that lineage. Likewise, at the most basic level, you are a member of a language community if you can use its language (Ostler 2005: 8).

In his other book, *A Biography of Latin* (2007), Ostler traces out a history, including its social dimension, of Latin. In a very crucial passage he says:

> Languages create worlds to live in, not just in the minds of their speakers, but in their lives, and their descendants' lives, where those ideas become real. The world that Latin created is today called Europe. And as Latin formed Europe, it also inspired the Americas. Latin has in fact been the constant in the cultural history of the West, extending over two millennia. In a way, it has been too central to be noticed: like the air Europe breathed, it has pervaded everything (Ostler 2007: 20).

The history of the promotion of Hebrew in Israel is another case in point (Rabin 1973; Fellman 1974). Indeed, such studies are available for many languages: the death of Irish for economic reasons 'which have promoted the modernization' of the Irish-speaking parts of Ireland (Hindley 1990: 248); the standardization of French and its increased use in domains of power (Lodge

1993); the relationship of language with social experience and historiography (Corfield 1991), and so on. However, it is generally only a few aspects of the use of a language in some domain which are investigated. This book, on the other hand, intends to extend the scope of the historical investigation to the use of Urdu in more social domains than has been done so far at least as far as South Asia is concerned.

This is not to say that scholars of South Asia have not attempted social histories involving language. One example is Farina Mir's doctoral dissertation on Punjabi popular narrative in British India which is a social history in the sense that it focuses on literary narratives like Hīr Rānjhā, the Punjabi equivalent of Juliet and Romeo, to understand the 'shared cultural sphere' of religious communities in the Punjab (Mir 2002: 344). Another good example of the kind of history I have in mind is Ulrike Stark's history of book publishing in India. Aptly entitled *An Empire of Books*, this is a study of the Naval Kishore Press (Stark 2008). In this study we find out how modernity affected the diffusion of the printed word in India; what social, economic and political conditions made such a wide scale diffusion possible and how it affected education, religious consciousness and, more relevant to our concerns, the construction of Hindu and Muslim identities in India. Another study relevant for our purposes is Christopher King's excellent analysis of the construction of the Hindu identity through the linguistic activities of the Nagari Pracharini Sabha (King 1974). Subtitled as 'A Study in the Social and Political History of the Hindi Language', this study focuses on the construction of the Hindu identity through language planning activities and its expression through linguistic symbols of which the Devanagari script and Sanskritic vocabulary are the most notable.

Yet another paradigmatic (meaning a pattern or prototype in one of the meanings given by Thomas Kuhn [1962: 175]) study is Francesca Orsini's *The Hindi Public Sphere 1920–40* (2002). This

study looks at the creation of discursive spaces in the Hindi-using public which allow us 'to draw a picture of the Hindi literary sphere in all its variety of traditions, tastes, audiences, and modes of transmission' (Orsini 2002: 7) in order to understand literary productivity during the twenty years the book focuses upon. And what emerges out of this investigation is an understanding of ideas and discourses about history and politics in the public sphere. Another study of the 'information order' of the British empire in the Hindi-speaking areas, by C.A. Bayly, uses the term 'ecumene' for the 'cultural and political debate' in this area in which Urdu as well as Hindi, both in their high forms and as the common spoken language, play so important a role (Bayly 1996: 182). Indeed, this language (especially its Urdu form) took 'on the character of the public tongue of the ecumene' (Bayly 1996: 193) though the Devanagari character was used for some kinds of works in some areas since the boundary markings we are now familiar with were not so rigidly applied till the end of the nineteenth century. Our study draws upon these works and, in fact, expands their investigation into the way the use of Urdu in social domains helps us understand vital aspects of the social and political lives of the Muslims of Pakistan and North India.

As mentioned above, an important aspect of this study is to find out how the Hindu and Muslim identities were constructed as a result of modernity which was a consequence of colonial rule in India. This may not have taken the same turn without the British intervention in South Asia. Indeed, the idea that numbers are politically significant—for quotas in jobs, admissions in educational institutions, government patronage—was created by the British who introduced modern concepts like representation of the people, equality before a secular legal system and the creation of an ubiquitous public service all over India. When the Indians experienced the census, they found that the category 'Mahomedan' (Muslim) could be disempowered or empowered, impoverished or enriched, deprived or benefited, depending on

a number of factors out of which the only ones they understood were numbers and loyalty to the rulers. This game of numbers created the perception of a monolithic Muslim community—suppressing sectarian (Shia, Sunni, Aga Khani, Bohra, etc.); class and linguistic or ethnic divisions—which was held together by Islam and Urdu. The mirror image of this was the construction of the Hindu 'Other' held together by Hindutva and Hindi (King 1994; Dalmia 1997). Besides investing political and economic significance in the categories of 'Muslim' and 'Hindu', modernity also made it possible to disseminate language much more widely than ever before. The printing press, the schooling system, the textbooks, the political speeches and pamphlets, and later radio, television and the cinema all spread out standardized versions of languages—mostly Hindi and Urdu in North India and the areas now comprising Pakistan—which created communities (Muslims and Hindus) much as 'print capitalism' created nationalistic identities in modern Europe in a process described by Benedict Anderson (1983).

Almost a century—from the middle of the nineteenth century till the creation of Pakistan—of the Hindi-Urdu controversy, makes us realize how potent the symbolic value of language was in the creation of the politicized modern Muslim and Hindu identities.

Narrowing the focus to Urdu-Hindi, while no complete social history exists, there are numerous studies of the use of both languages in social domains. There is, for instance, Vasuda Dalmia's chapter on the way Hindi became a symbol of Hindu identity in the nineteenth century (Dalmia 1997: 146–221). And Christopher King's more detailed work on the Hindi movement and its contribution to the development of the Hindu identity in the nineteenth century (King 1994). And, indeed, all histories of the Hindi-Urdu controversy—and there are many to choose from such as Gupta 1970; Brass 1974: 119–181; Dittmer 1972; Fatehpuri 1977; and Rai 2001 besides the works mentioned earlier—deal

with identity formation when the two languages are used in schools, courts of law, journalism, and the lower bureaucracy.

However, this macro-analysis of the indexicality of Urdu and Hindi along religious lines does not always correspond to facts on the ground. Rizwan Ahmad, a socio-linguistic researcher on Urdu, after his research in Old Delhi points out that the 'ideologies about the indexicality of Urdu changed significantly in post–1947 language discourse' in India (Ahmad 2007: 195). First, while both Muslims and Hindus claimed to speak Urdu in the pre-partition era, those born after 1947 associate with it if they are Muslims but not if they are Hindus. This has already been pointed out by many scholars including—perhaps most clearly—by Christopher King (1994), but what is new is that in the third generation, at least in the ghettoized population of Old Delhi, Muslims do not pronounce the distinctive phonemes of Urdu replacing them with the Hindi ones (Ahmad 2007: 197). They consider Urdu 'the language of their parents' and do not have functional literacy in the distinctive Perso-Arabic script of Urdu (Ahmad 2007: 200). This kind of work points to another direction of research on the social identity of Urdu, i.e. through language ideology and indexicality.

Language ideology is defined as 'sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization of justification of perceived language structure and use' (Silverstein 1979: 193). And it is part of ideology to see language as indexing a certain group identity. There are social differentiations—socio-economic class, religious affiliation, ethnic identity—which may or may not be correlated with linguistic differentiations. In the US, for instance, Black English or Ebonics is related to African Americans. In Britain, the Received Pronunciation (RP) is related to the educated middle and upper classes, and in Pakistan Pashto is related with the Pashtun identity. But these indexical relationships function within a society and are invested with significance by the ideology of that social order. This ideology creates the sets

of beliefs we operate through while making sense of the world and living in it, and language ideology is a sub-set of this ideology of life. But ideology, including language ideology, and the indexicality contingent upon it is socially situated. This means that as external and internal factors change, language ideology and indexicality both change (Irvine and Gal 2000; Silverstein 1998; Woolard 1998; Wassink and Dyer 2004). This explains why the social reality of Urdu has changed over time and space and why it remains in flux. One purpose of the book is to understand how our language ideologies are constructed and how they help us index Urdu with a certain identity in pre-partition India as well as in modern India and Pakistan.

This language ideology is part of a certain consensus among cultural authority figures about certain prescriptive norms of the 'standard' language. Pre-modern languages have a lot of variation—spellings, words, aspects of grammar and pro-nunciation—and this is precisely what prescriptive authorities eliminate. Jim Milroy, an authority on prescriptivism in language, distinguishes between the 'language-internal' and 'language-external' aspects of the ideology which informs prescriptivism. The uniformity of grammar, spellings, diction, etc., are the 'language-internal' factors, while the selection of one variety of the language and then diffusing it through writing and teaching is the 'language-external' one (Milroy 2002: 8). The standardization of Urdu, as we shall see, followed the same process.

At this point it may be useful to give a synoptic outline of the book. This introduction is followed by three chapters entitled 'Names', 'Age', 'Origins and Historiography'. In a sense all of them relate to the crucial Chapter 5 on the identity of the language we now call Urdu. It has had several names—Hindvi, Hindi, Hindustani for instance—which have a bearing on its identity in the past as well as today. Its age also has political and social implications so crucial for its identity. For, if it is an Indian language then it belongs to Hindus as well as Muslims, but if it

is a product of the military camps of the Mughals—as many Pakistani school textbooks claim it to be—then it started off as a symbol of military conquest and remains a Muslim preserve. As for the debate on the origins—Sindh, Punjab, Delhi, Maharashtra— it too has implications for identity: regional, national and communal. The chapter on 'identity' describes the standardization of Urdu from the eighteenth century onwards. It is argued that it was this process of standardization which associated the language with the Muslim identity in North India. That is why it is sub-titled 'the Islamization of Urdu'. Chapters 6 and 7 are on the association of Urdu with two contradictory themes: religion and the amorous and erotic. It was roughly from the late eighteenth century onwards that Urdu became the major vehicle of Islam in South Asia. But at the same time, at least till the twentieth century, Urdu literature was also associated with the ghazal, the refinement of the courtesan's speech and the decadent aristocracy of Lucknow—all of which, in turn, associated Urdu with love and beauty, the romantic and the aesthetic, the amorous and the erotic. In this context, too, the suppression of the amorous and the erotic associations in favour of the religious ones has political reasons and implications for the construction of the Muslim identity in South Asia.

Chapter 8 is about the learning of Hindustani by the British. This is important because the British role in promoting Urdu has not been fully documented. It is also important because British understandings of the language led to classificatory categories (such as the ones in the census) which then constructed and reinforced ethno-linguistic identities. Chapter 9 looks at the processes which led to the introduction of Urdu as the official language of two major princely states: Kashmir and Hyderabad, and a few smaller ones too. The political reasons for such a change and its implications have been traced out in some detail. The last five chapters are on the use of Urdu in the service of the state and the private sector. While Chapter 10 focuses on

employment in the lower levels of the judiciary and the administration in North India, the subsequent four chapters focus more exclusively on such crucial domains as education, print, radio, films, and the television, i.e. the media and entertainment. Once again this is not a straightforward historical narrative but one which is informed by insights into identity politics and the play of (communal) ideological narratives in these domains. The conclusion sums up the insights gained by the study with some comments on the future of the language.

The sources of this book are mostly historical but information about contemporary policies and practices is obtained through interviews, unstructured conversations, observation, and internet sources. Among the historical sources are the *tazkarās* (hagiographies, narratives, anecdotes, and biographical infor-mation) of mystics or Sufi saints and their conversations (*malfūzāt*). The former genre is mostly hyperbolic and not objective, being written by those who had blind faith in the saint. They are mostly near-contemporary as the writing appeared after the demise of the saint. The *malfūzāt* are contemporary but even these are not always correct as Khwaja Banda Nawaz Gesu Daraz (1312–1421) himself pointed out in 802/1400 (Hussaini 1401: 244–245). However, his own *malfūzāt*, written by his son Syed Mohammad Akbar Hussaini, was authenticated by him in own lifetime (Hussaini 1401: 587). The Sheikh also pronounced the *malfūzāt* of Sheikh Nizamudin Auliya (1238–1325) entitled *Fawāid ul Fawād*, collected by Amir Hasan Sanjri from 28 January 1308 to 5 September 1322, as authentic (Hussaini 1401: 244). These sources relied upon written language and to use it as evidence for the existence of the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi is problematic. As Ursula Schaefer points out in her 'Introduction' to the beginning of standardization in medieval Europe:

> As we have no choice but to deal with what has come down to us—more or less by chance—*in writing*, the data are, for one thing "bad" because they are selective in number and diverse in quality. They

are also "bad" because they give—at best—a 'mediated' picture (!) of what might have been the language actually spoken. This has, for a long time, been the 'big lie' of historical linguistics as scholars have tacitly glossed over the materiality of their evidences (Schaefer 2006: 8).

This weakness is acknowledged but the only other option, in the absence of the spoken word in this case, is not to venture any opinion about the past of any language. I believe, therefore, in using the written sources with caution and being tentative in my conclusions rather than not doing linguistic history at all.

Doing linguistic history, therefore, requires the mastery of different archives and different methods of research. Being a history, the historical method of research is, of course, dominant, but knowledge about modern policies, regarding the use of Urdu in different, contemporary, social domains, requires interviewing and other techniques. Document analysis, especially those pertaining to language policies, is also a major technique of research. In short, the book combines all feasible research methods and techniques in order to obtain data which is analysed in the light of the constructionist theories of identity-construction and their mobilization into the political arena. That is why the book is an attempt to understand the use of Urdu in the social domains as well as the political implications of such use. In short, the book is of as much interest to a social historian as it is to a sociolinguist and a political scientist.

2

Names

The name Urdu—first used only 'around 1780' by the poet Ghulam Hamadani Mushafi (1750–1824) (Faruqi 2003: 806)—itself biases the user/hearer into assumptions about its identity, which are implicitly, and in the final analysis, political. The word is from Turkish and refers to camp, a military cantonment or a place of the residence of the elite (*Urdū-ē-Muallā*). It is associated with the theory that the language was born in the Mughal military camps because military life necessitated the interaction of Muslim and Hindus. Such associations tend to disown at least four hundred years of the history of the language when it was called, according to Shamsur Rahman Faruqi, (roughly in that order): Hindvi, Hindi, Dihlavi, Gujri, Dakani and Rekhtah (Faruqi 2003: 806). Amir Khusrau (1253–1325) in his *Masnavī Nuh Sipihr* (718/1318) says that each province of the India of his day had a distinctive language which is not derived or borrowed from any other and then mentions the following languages:

Sindī ō Lāhorī ō Kashmirī ō kabar
Dhōr Samandrī ō talangī ō Gujar
Ma 'abarī ō Gorī ō Bangāl ō Awad
Dehli ō pīrāminash andar hamā had
ī hamā Hindvīst kē za ayyām-ē-kuhan
'āma bakār ast bahar gūna sukhan (Khusrau 1318: 179–180)[1]

The last three lines mean:
(Delhi and in its environs/it is Hindi since ancient times/which is used ordinarily for all kinds of conversation).

Grierson gives the modern names of these languages as follows: Sindhi, Panjabi, Kashmiri, Dogra of Jammu, Kanarese of Mysore, Telugu, Tamil of the Coromandel coast, Northern Bengali, Bengali, Eastern Hindi, and Western Hindi (Grierson Vol. 1: 1). Writing in 1590, about three hundred years later, the Mughal man of letters, Abul Fazl, wrote in the *Āīn-ē-Akbarī*, 'that India has many languages and these forms of speech are not mutually intelligible'. He then gives the following list of languages:

> *Dēhlī Bangālā Multān Marwār Gujrāt Tilangānā Marhat Karnātik Sind Afghan Shāl (kē miān Sind ō Kābul ō qandhār ast) Balōjistan Kashmīr* (Fazl Vol. 3, 1590: 45).[2]
>
> The words in the brackets mean: 'is between Sind and Kabul and Qandhar'.

Grierson gives the following names for these languages: Western Hindi, Bengali, Lahnda, Western Rajasthani, Gujarati, Telugu, Marathi, Kanarese, Sindhi, Pashto, Balochi, and Kashmiri (Grierson, Vol. 1).

These lists tell us about the linguistic classification of the authors, living as they did so many centuries apart, and of George Grierson who supplied the British names of the languages as used in *The Linguistic Survey of India.* What is interesting is that all of these classifications help us understand the identity of Urdu only partially.

If we take the myth of Urdu's birth as a language created in military camps in order to facilitate interaction between Muslims and Hindus, then we would be calling Urdu a pidgin language. The definition of a pidgin is that it 'is a reduced language that results from extended contact between groups of people with no language in common' (Holm 1988: 4–5). But Urdu, or its ancestor, is not a reduced language in any sense of that term. Its grammatical structure and other features qualify it for a full language and not an *ad hoc* tool of communication. It is not a creole either because, although creolization is 'a process of

expansion rather than reduction' and creoles, unlike pidgins, have native speakers. But creoles are said to have a pidgin or jargon—'a variety that has been radically reduced (Holm 1988: 8)—in their ancestry. There is no evidence that the ancestor of Urdu was such a variety. Nor have linguists ever included Urdu and Hindi in their studies of pidgin and creole languages. In a classic study of pidgins and creoles the linguist Gumperz reports how the Urdu of Kupwar, a village on the border of Maharashtra and Dravidian-languages speaking area, stands in relation to Standard Urdu, as Haitian Creole stands in relation to Standard French. Kupwar Urdu differs from Creole in that 'its starting point was not a pidgin' (Gumperz & Wilson 1971: 166). In other words, like English and French, Urdu too may be pidginized and creolized but it never started off as a pidgin.

The theory which is most credible is that there was a base language, call it Hindi for convenience, spoken in pre-Muslim India which was a fully developed language in its own right. This language came in contact with other languages—Persian and Arabic mostly—and absorbed words, morphemes and even phonemes from them at various levels. If the emphasis is on the mixing of Persian, Arabic and Turkish words to the exclusion of the base itself (the language in which these words were mixed in the first place), there is a definitional problem; a problem of linguistic identity. Mixing takes place in many languages but it is not given the political significance which it receives in Urdu and modern Hindi. Modern English, for instance, derives much of its technical and learned vocabulary from Norman French, Latin and Greek but it is called a Germanic language and refers to a Germanic tribe, the Angles, who lived in England before the Norman conquest in 1066 rather than the Norman French or the Romans, etc.

That Urdu contains hybrid words does not make it a pidgin or creole. Hybrids are very much part of English and French as both languages borrowed much of their formal vocabulary from Latin

and Greek. In a study of 929 hybrids of Urdu we learn that 'Hybrid words created by means of native, Hindi affixes make up only 28% of the whole amount, and adequately, a group of hybrids formed by Perso-Arabic formatives comprises 72% of it' (Kuczkiewicz-Fraś 2003: 103; also see her 2008 dictionary mentioned earlier). This is understandable if one looks at the words which are not hybrids as most of these words are the basic means for daily living (body parts, food items, relationships, etc.). Thus the theory that the hybrids 'were oral in nature, i.e. created at the very first level of inter-language contact between Indians and Muslims' (Ibid., 108), misses the point that in a hybrid like '*bin-bāp*' (without father) the operative word is the Hindi word *bāp* and not the Persian affix *bin* or *bē*. So, while they may well have been oral in nature, it is the base language which is important and which is doing the borrowing and not the languages from which the borrowing is being done.

In short what is wrong with the theory that Urdu is a pidgin is that it takes away the status of Urdu as a fully formed language before the arrival of the Muslims. The association with camps, as the name Urdu implies, makes the language contingent upon conquest whereas languages borrow words from other languages in all kinds of situations and not only in military camps. Indeed, all names of Urdu and its ancestor are implicitly political as they have associations given below.

Name	Period of use	Associations	Ideological Bias
Hindi	13th–19th century	India, Hindus	Indianness. Is now used for Modern Hindi in India.
Dēhlavī	*c.* 13th–14th century	Delhi	Regional particularism. No longer in use.

Name	Period of use	Associations	Ideological Bias
Hindvī/ Hinduī	13th–19th century	India, Hindus	Indianness. Hindu identity. No longer used.
Gujrī	15th century	Gujarat; Gojri language	Regional particularism. No longer in use.
Dakkanī or Dakhni	15th–18th century	Deccan	Regional particularism. No longer in use.
Indostan	*c.* 17th–18th centuries	India	Indianness. Used only by a few English travellers.
Moors	18th century	Muslims of Spain	Muslim identity. Was used only by a few Europeans but never gained currency.
Hindus-tānī	18th–20th century	India, especially North India (Hindustan)	Includes all Indians of all religions but excludes Pakistan.
Rēkhtā	18th–19th centuries	Mixed Persian and Urdu; sub-standard	Assumes that Persian is the standard language implying the inferiority of India's local languages.
Urdū	18th century	Muslims; Mughal military camps; mixture of Muslim languages with local Indian ones.	Muslim identity; Pakistani identity.

HINDI, HINDVI OR HINDUI

This label has been used by outsiders, especially Muslims, for the languages of India (Hind). Thus it is not always clear exactly which language and in which script, is meant by 'Hindi'. Even as late as the nineteenth century, the term Hindi was sometimes used for Gujarati in addition to what we now call Hindi and Urdu. One instance of such usage is in the story of Baba Ali Sher, a saint of Indian Gujarat (Khetch) who flourished during the time of Sheikh Farid-u'd-din Ganj-i-Shakar (1175–1265), also called Baba Farid of Ajodhan, in what is now Pakistani Punjab. Once Baba Sher Ali was sitting naked when Baba Farid arrived to meet him and he (Ali Sher) said: 'bring clothes for the guardian of the Islamic law arrives'. The words of the Persian chronicler, although writing in the late nineteenth century are: *'bazubān-ē-Hindi farmūdand* l̄ogr̄o lāō sar sharā' nak̄ot avē chē'. Some of these words are clearly in Gujarati but the author uses the label Hindi for them (Khan 1889 Vol. 3: 60).

Sometimes, the usage is so ambiguous that one cannot make out which language is meant. For instance, a famous saint of the Deccan, according to Khwaja Banda Nawaz Gesu Daraz in 802/1399–1400 Sheikh Ali Khatri, an illiterate saint, was shown words written in Persian, Hindi and Arabic. In between there were a few verses from the Quran. The Sheikh recognized them as, according to him, they were radiant. Here it is not clear whether Hindi is a variant of the ancestor of Hindi-Urdu or some South Indian language. However, it does seem probable that these words of 'Hindi' too were in some derivative of the Arabic script (Hussaini 1401: 200).

However, sometimes the chronicler is aware of the local language being different from the one he calls Hindvi or Hindi and makes this clear. In *Siyār ul Auliyā*, a *tazkarā* of Sheikh Nizamuddin Auliya, by Syed Mubarak Kirmani also called Mir Khurd (d. 770/1368–69), there is another story about Sheikh Farid. Sheikh Farid looked at Sheikh Isa, a Sufi disciple who

served him, because he was standing aghast as Sheikh Farid's prayer mat had been occupied by Sheikh Alauddin who was then a child. He smiled and said: '*mubukh tē baē bazubān-ē-ã diyār*' ('sit on the *mubukh* in the language of that area') (Kirmani *c.* 14th, century: 204). Here the language, which is recognizably Punjabi-Siraiki, is not called Hindvi or Hindi.

Hindi, Hindvi and Hindui are all used as variants of each other and they are used mostly for the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi. Although the most commonly used word in the earlier sources is Hindvi, all these terms occur in medieval sources inter-changeably. Amir Khusrau, always interested in language, used both 'Hindvi' and 'Hindi' in two meanings: for the language of India (Hind); and for the language of the region around Delhi. Khusrau has been credited with being the father of modern Urdu and Hindi (Sharma 2006: 81). Songs, riddles and anecdotes in verse attributed to him are quoted in innumerable books and even sung in South Asia. However, it is not clear that he actually wrote all or even any of them, though it is clear that he did write in a language he called 'Hindi' or 'Hindvi' since he 'gave some samples of Hindi verse to friends as gifts'. (*Juzvē chand nazm-ē-hindvī nēz nazrē dōstã kardā shudā ast*) (Khusrau 1293: 63). He was aware that this language changed after every hundred miles, as the varieties or dialects of all unstandardized languages do, while Persian was uniform all over India (*Zubān-ē-Hindvī har sad karōhē har gurōhē rā istilāhē dīgar ast ammā Pārsī dar ĩ chahār hazār ō and farsang yekē ast*) (1293: 29).

The term Hindi kept being used even when Urdu was already in use. For instance, in *Nasīhat ul Muslimīn* (1822), Khurram Ali states that he wanted to refute heresy for those who did not understand Arabic by translating the verses of the Quran 'in the Hindi language clearly' (*Hindī zubānmẽ sāf sāf*) (Ali 1822: 2). Another book on the rituals of Islam, written nearly at the same time, is called *Masāil-ē-Hindi* (Anon 1818). Maulvi Ikram Uddin, in his exegesis of a Quranic verse says: 'if the benefits of the Sūrā'

Fatehā are explained in the Hindi language' all Muslims will enjoy their prayers (Uddin 1308/1890–91: 2). A copy of the Quran, translated by Syed Waliullah in Arabic, Persian and 'Hindi'—also called 'Hindoostanee' by the Englishman, William Wright, for whom it was written—is preserved in the library of the University of Heidelberg. It begins 'with the name of God' (*sāth nānō khudaī kē*) and is a complete translation in beautifully written hand-writing in 512 pages. The fourth column, which says '*angrēzī*' (English), is left blank (Waliullah 1837). But even at this time a versified commentary in the Quran in Punjabi, mixed with Urdu, is said to be in 'Hindvi' (Mohammad n.d.: 2). However, in most cases Hindi was the name of Urdu till almost the end of the nineteenth century when it came to be reserved for Sanskritized Hindi and the dialects of the Hindi belt.

Dehlavi

Amir Khusrau in his work *Nuh Sipihr*, written in 1318, mentions the language of 'Delhi and its environs' (*Dehlī ō pirāmanash andar hamā had*) (Khusrau 1318: 180). Sheikh Bajan (d. 912/1506–07), writing in Gujarat, calls his language both Hindvi and Dehlavi. One of his poems begins with the Persian words: '*sift-ē-duniyā ba zubān-ē-Dehlavī guftā*' (I describe the world in the language of Delhi) (quoted from Shirani 1930–31 in 1965: 168). The poem which follows is in the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi and is quite intelligible to modern readers:

> *Yē fitnī kyā kisē miltī haē*
> *Jab miltī hāē tab chaltī hāē*
> (where and how does one find this evil one)?
> And when one does she [the world] seduces one)
> (Shirani 1965: 168).

At times the language of the same poem is called both Hindvi and Dehlavi (Shirani 1965: 168).

The term was used till the eighteenth century when it was replaced by others.

Gᴜᴊʀɪ, Gᴏᴊʀɪ ᴀɴᴅ Gᴜᴊᴀʀᴀᴛɪ

These mutually interchangeable terms for specimens of sequences of words, clearly recognizable as closer to Hindi-Urdu than the languages which now go by these names, are found in the works of medieval writers. Most of them were in Gujarat but some were also in the Deccan. Sheikh Burhanuddin Janum wrote his *kalmāt ul Haqāēq* in 990/1582 in the Deccan (Bijapur) but he used this name for the language of the book.

> *Sab yō zubān gujrī, nām ĩ kitāb*
> (All give Gujri language-the name of this book).

The language is mixed with Persian but sequences like: *isdil kī* (of this heart) and *dhartā haē* (puts) are easily recognizable as Hindi-Urdu (for detailed discussion see Jain in Jafer and Jain Vol. 2, 1998: 357–362).

Shirani gives further details about Gujri or 'Gujarati Urdu' in the 10th/15th–16th centuries. He mentions Sheikh Bahauddin Bajan (d. 912/1506–07), Shah Ali Mohammad Jeo Gam Dhani (d. 973/1565–66) and others writers of Indian Gujarat who call the language by various names including Hindi, Hindvi and Dehlavi. It appears that the writers of Urdu-Hindi in the Deccan kept using the term Gujri in order to indicate the relationship of their language with that used in Gujarat (Shirani 1930 and 1931 in 1965: 183–184). The language is also called Gujarati as in the works of Khub Mohammad Chishti who also shows his awareness of deliberately using Perso-Arabic diction in the 'Gujarati' base. For instance he says: 'I wrote every couplet in my own language Gujarati which has Persian and Arabic words' (*har yak shē'r bazubān-ē-khud tasnīf kardā and ō mīkunand ō man bazubān-ē-gujratī kē alfāz 'ajamī ō 'arabi ast*) (Shirani 1930 and 1931 in 1965: 191). In

short, Gujri was that special style of the Urdu-Hindi language which had assimilated Persian and Arabic words.

Dakhni

The terms Dakhni, Dekani, Dakhini, and Deccani are used interchangeably for the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi, as used in the Deccan from the fifteenth century onwards. Specimens in the language, both verse and prose, with the names Dakhni or Hindi, are given in Naseeruddin Hashmi's *Dakan mẽ Urdū* (Hashmi 1923: 13–15). Besides the *Masnavī Kadam Rāō Padam Rāō* (1421–1435), probably the earliest specimen of verse of some length in the language, there are other samples written in the language identified as Dakhni by their authors. Abdul Haq searched out a number of manuscripts in this language which he sometimes called 'Old Urdu' (*Urdū-ē-Qadīm*) and published them (Haq 1961). While his claim that Khwaja Banda Nawaz Gesu Daraz's *Mērāj ul Āshiqīn*, supposedly written sometime in the beginning of the fifteenth century, has now been refuted (Jain in Jafer and Jain Vol. 2, 1998: 293), we are still left with *Sab Ras* (1045/1635–36) and the poetry (*kulliyāt*) of Quli Qutab Shah (1580–1611) which was published by Mohiuddin Qadri Zor in 1940. The *kulliyāt* was edited in 1025/1611 by the King's nephew, Muhammad Qutab Shah, and is recognized as the first 'non-religious Urdu verse we possess' (Matthews 1991: 39)—a claim which makes sense only by excluding *Kadam Rāō* which is indeed, much more far removed linguistically from modern Urdu than this work.

Indostan and Moors

One of the first names for what came to be called 'Hindustani' used by the British in India was 'Indostan'. Edward Terry, the English traveller who began his voyage on 3 February 1615, wrote as follows:

For the language of this Empire, I meane the vulgar, it is called
Indostan, a smooth tongue, and easie to be pronounced, which they
write as wee to the right hand. The Learned Tongues are Persian and
Arabian, which they write backward, as the Hebrewes to the left
(Purchas 1905: 31).

The innumerable words of this language used by the early
Englishmen in their documents leave us in no doubt that this was
the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi.

Yet another name used by early Englishmen is Moors. The
term is explained in *Hobson-Jobson* as follows:

The term *Moors* is probably now entirely obsolete, but down to 1830,
at least, some old officers of the Royal army and some old Madras
civilians would occasionally use the term as synonymous with what
the former would also call 'the black language'. [Moors for Urdū was
certainly in use among the old European pensioners at Chunār as
late as 1892.] (Yule and Burnell 1903: 584).

The authors cite thirteen examples from the Anglo-Indian
literature, of the period starting from 1752 till 1804, of the use
of this term for the language which later came to be called
Hindustani (Ibid., 584–585). The most well-known usage is that
of George Hadley (d. 1798), who wrote a grammar of it in 1772,
in his book which is entitled, *Grammatical Remarks on the Practical
and Vulgar Dialect of the Indostan Language Commonly called Moors
with a Vocabulary English and Moors...* (Hadley 1772). The book was
reprinted several times and the 1784 edition has a 'Moorish
vocabulary' (Hadley 1784: iii). But 'Moors' was 'spoken in its
purity between Europeans and their native servants in Calcutta
and Bombay' (Arnot and Forbes 1828: 16) and was more of a
pidgin language than the language which came to be called
Hindustani later.

However, since this was the current term in use, even John
Borthwick Gilchrist (1759–1841), the father of modern Urdu and

Hindi prose, who was later to call the language Hindustani, wrote in the beginning of his career that upon his arrival in Bombay in 1782, he 'sat resolutely down to acquire what was then termed as the Moors…' (Siddiqi 1963: 21). But both these names were transitory and were given up by the British for Hindustani as well as Urdu and Hindi in due course.

Rekhta

In his excellent article entitled '*Rēkhta*', Mahmud Shirani discusses how the term has been understood by writers of Urdu (Shirani 1926 in 1965: 1–9). There is not much which one can add to this scholarly exposition. However, turning to the contemporary editions of the well-known dictionaries called *Fīrōz ul Lughāt*, both Farsi and Urdu, the word is defined in Persian as (1) fallen, (2) spread out, and (3) fashioned metal. In Urdu it is defined as (1) fallen, (2) spread out, (3) confused, (4) mixture language, (5) Urdu which is made of many languages, (6) The couplets of Urdu, (7) material required for making a house, and (8) concrete building.

Mohammad Hussain Azad, one of the most important early historians of Urdu, says that Urdu has been made by the words of many languages just as a house is made of bricks, lime and clay (Azad *c.* 19th century: 21–22). The different meanings given in the dictionary and reproduced above are used by earlier writers (Shirani 1926 in 1965: 1). Initially rekhta meant music created by the fusion of Indian and Persian music. Later, a verse with half a line or one line in Persian and the other in Hindi was called by this name. Still later, probably in the eighteenth century, the name came to be used for Urdu. This name overlapped with Hindi in the beginning of the century and with Urdu by the end of it. The poet Mushafi (b. 1141 to 1156/1728–29 to 1743) who is credited with having used the word Urdu for this language for the first time used Hindi and rekhta as synonyms. In his *Tazkarā-ē-Hindi* (1236/1860–61) he wrote: '*Rēkhtā fī*

zamānana pa pāyā ā'lā fārsī rasīdā (balkē az ū bēhtar gardīdā)'
(Rekhta in this period has reached the level of Persian [indeed it
has become even better than it]) (Mushafi 1861: hē).

    Qaim Chandpuri (1135/1722—208/1793–94), in his *Makhzan-ē-
Nikāt* (1168/1754–55), also uses this term. He begins by
erroneously attributing (Chandpuri 1754–55: 6) 'one or two
couplets' of this language (*yak dō baēt rēkhtā*) to the Persian poet
Sa'adi but, as later research has proved, this was another poet of
the same name (Sprenger 1852: 513–519). Qaim also claims that
he is the first to write brief biographical notes along with
specimens from their verse of 'rekhta' poets. Incidentally, Mir
Taqi Mir, in his *Tazkarā Nikāt ul Shu'arā*, written sometime before
1168/1754–55 in Delhi, had claimed that 'it is not unknown that
in the art of rekhta the couplets of which are like those of
Persian in the language of the Exalted City of Shahjahanabad
Dehli no book before this one had been written' (*pōshīda namãnd
kē dar fan-ē-rēkhtā ke shē'r īst bataōr shē'r fārsī bazubān urdu-ē-
mu'allā Shāhjahānābād Dēhlī kitābē tā hāl tasnīf nashudā*) (Mir
1755: 9). But Mir also uses the terms Rekhta for code switching
in Old Urdu-Hindi and Persian. For instance, the first hemistich
is in Persian and the other in Hindi; half the hemistich is in
Persian and the rest in Hindi and in the third type particles and
verbs are in Persian. Mir only condemns the last as ugly (*qabīh*)
but the rest are approved of (Mir 1755: 161).

    The term rekhta kept being used, along with Urdu, by all the
great poets of Urdu including Ghalib.

> *Rēkhtā kē tum hī ustād nahĩ hō Ghālib*
> *Suntē haẽ aglē zamānē mẽ kōyī mīr bhī thā*
> (You are not the only master of Rekhta O! Ghalib!
> One hears that in times gone by there was one Mir).

It appears that contemporaries differentiated between Hindi and
Rekhta. Shirani quotes from the translation of the Quran by Shah
Abdul Qadir (1205/1790–91) in which it is stated that Hindi, not

Rekhta, is used, so that the translation is intelligible to ordinary people (Shirani 1926 in 1965: 9). Prince Azfari, while referring to his language as Hindi and Hindustani elsewhere, uses the term Rekhta for his Urdu verse (Azfari 1806: 127). This implies that Rekhta referred to the Persianized diction of high culture, and especially, the ghazal. It is to be noted that this period, the end of the eighteenth century, is the time when Persianized Urdu was being created and it was deviating from ordinary Hindi used by the common people. Javed Majeed, studying the boundaries of Rekhta, uses the concept of 'leaky diglossia', i.e. the 'High' (H) variety of a language in which the 'Low' (L) one has intruded. According to him, 'The term *rekhta* is evocative of the tension that arises between an intermediate form and the 'High' language it has tied itself to'. In this case the L-variety is not of the same language but of another one—hence Fasold's concept of diglossia (1984) is more relevant rather than that of Ferguson (1959)—but, Majeed suggests that it (L) 'while simultaneously trying to enhance its prestige, is struggling to establish itself as a corpus of verse in its own right' (Majeed 1995: 193). But Rekhta was an intermediate name and fell out of use by the end of the nineteenth century.

HINDUSTANI

This is the language which I have called Urdu-Hindi and ordinary Urdu and Hindi at different places in this book. Being the common heritage of South Asians—both Hindus and Muslims—it is a very important language and, therefore, the term Hindustani will be examined in great detail. George Grierson says that 'the word "Hindostani" was coined under European influence, and means the language of Hindostan' (Grierson, Vol. 3: 43). Indeed, he adds that 'it appears to be Gilchrist who about 1787 first coined the word "Hindōstanī" or, as he spelt it, "Hindoostanee"' (Ibid., 43). However, the terms Hindustani or 'Hindustani language' exist in a few sources of pre-British times. For instance,

Zahiruddin Babar (1483–1530), the founder of the Mughal empire, says in his autobiography that: 'I said to someone who knew Hindustani, "tell him these words one by one and make him understand..."' (Babar 1528: 318).[3] The person to whom Babar wanted to convey how much he owed to him was Dawlat Khan, a Lodhi Chief who had fastened two swords to his body in order to fight him. Babar meant the 'language of Hindustan' and not necessarily a language with this name, nor is it certain that this North Indian language was the ancestor of modern Urdu and Hindi. However, it is clear that a foreigner coming to Hindustan, as North India was called, found it natural to refer to the language he associated with it, as Hindustani. Mulla Wajhi, the author of *Sab Ras* describes the language of his book as '*zubān* Hindustan' (Wajhi 1635: 16). The term Hindustani occurs in the *Tārīkh-ē-Farishtā* about Ibrahim Adil Shah, a ruler of the Deccan (1580–1595–96), as one of the languages he was proficient in. The exact words are that the King, 'thus became an expert in Persian and like this he spoke Persian very well. And till he did not speak in Hindustani nobody could understand that he knew any language except Persian' (*Fārsī khuān gar dahīd ō banō'ī fārsī rā khūb mī guft ke tā bahundstānī mutakallam namī shud hīchkas namī tavānist fahmīd ke ghair az farsī bazubān-ē-dīgar ashnāi dārad*) (Farishta, Vol. 2, *c.* 1612: 80). Mulla Abdul Hameed Lahori, the author of *Badshah Nama*, i.e. a history of Shahjahan (r. 1628–58), written sometime before the 1640s, uses the words '*Hindustānī zubān*' twice in a passage in which he describes music, songs and literature. At one place, while describing a famous musician, Lal Khan, he calls him the doyen of the 'singers of the Hindustani language' (*naghmā sarāyān-ē-Hindustānī zubān*). A little further in the same passage he mentions 'writings demonstrated in the Hindustani language' (*tasnīfī ast ke bahindustāni zubān barguzardah*) (Lahori *c.* 1640s: 5). As to which language is meant is not clear. But it was probably some dialect of Hindi-Urdu. This becomes clear when Lahori goes on to tell the reader that a certain Raja

of Gwalior knew all the subtleties of the musical and literary tradition of 'Hindustan' and that he brought out a new style in the language of Gwalior (Lahori, 6). This language, as we know from other sources, was considered the best form of 'Hindi' and was probably Braj Bhasha, i.e. one of the dialects of greater Hindi. Moreover, Khial Bukhari, a scholar of Pashto, claims in his introduction to the poetic collection of Ma'āz ullāh Mōhmand (fl. 1085/1674–75—1167/1715) that this Pashto poet had also written some Urdu verse and that in his 'handwritten manuscript he had not used the name "Urdu" for this language but had called it "Hindustani" (*qalmī nuskhē kē daghē jabē da pārā da 'Urdu' nōm na dē raoṛē-balkē da vartā 'Hindustānī' vaēlē dī*) (Bukhari 1958: 39). As this was at least seventy-two years before Gilchrist, and at a time when British usages had not gained currency in India, especially in the Pashto-speaking areas where Mohmand lived, it is likely that among the several names for Hindi-Urdu in India, Hindustani was one. The Mughal prince, Mirza Ali Bakht Zahiruddin Azfari (1173/1759–60—1243/1867–68), was brought up in captivity in a palace where he is not likely to have been influenced by British linguistic habits. And in his memoir *Wāqiāt-ē-Azfarī*, written between 1211/1796 and 1221/1806, he calls his language 'Hindi' (Azfari 1806: 74) and also 'Hindustani'. After quoting the Urdu couplets of a Nawab he says that 'in his Hindustani poetry his language is that of the gentlemen of Delhi' (*ō dar nazm Hindustānī siāq kalām bataōr mīrzāiyān Shāhjahānābād dāsht*) (Azfari 1806: 151). The earliest European travellers, such as Edward Terry (1616–1619), used the term 'Indostan' and 'Indostan tongue' for some widely spoken language of North India. Terry tells us that Thomas Coryat (1612–1617) learned the Persian 'and Indostan tongues' in Agra (Foster 1921: 284). While one cannot be certain which language or languages these foreigners called 'Indostan', there are clearly intelligible words of Urdu-Hindi in the fragments which are available in sources.

The British, like Babar, also associated the lingua franca of North India with the country called Hindustan. But they were modern rulers with efficient ways of spreading neologisms and so the term found greater currency, at least temporarily, than ever before. Let us now look at the various definitions of 'Hindustani' or 'Hindoostaneeh', etc., by the British before Grierson's monumental work, which has been referred to earlier.

William Carey (1761–1834), the pioneer of the Serampore mission which translated the Bible and published other religious material in the languages of India, learned Sanskrit and 'translated the *entire* Bible into Bengali, Oriya, Marathi, Hindi, Assamese, and Sanskrit' (Drewery 1979: 156). This implies that he was exposed to much more Sanskrit than Persian or Arabic. But perhaps other people in the mission did have knowledge of these languages too. Thus, we are told that the missionaries published their books in two languages which they thought were Muslim Hindustani and Hindu Hindustani. The first was full of Perso-Arabic diction, while the second with Sanskrit words. John Chamberlain, a missionary who arrived in Serampore in 1803, wrote a letter to Dr Ryland, principal of Bristol Academy, that 'the language called by Europeans "Hindoost'hanee" and the language of the Hindus are diverse' and then recommends:

> I suspect that if we would do good to the major part of the Hindoos, we must have scriptures in their own vernacular language, and must preach to them in that language too (Chamberlain in *Periodical Accounts No. xxiii*, p. 422 Quoted from Vedalankar 1969: 94).

This is perhaps what Alok Rai means when he says that these 'linguistic-religious communities had no existence except in the proselytizing designs of the missionaries' (Rai 2001: 25). However, religion is a subject which necessitates borrowing from the etymological roots it comes from, so Hindu texts did contain more Sanskritic words while Muslim ones (such as *Karbal Kathā*)

had more Perso-Arabic ones than songs, sayings, riddles, and ordinary conversation. Thus, what the missionaries did was to give impetus to an incipient trend for imagining linguistic identities in relation to the etymological roots of ones' diction. In time this became more and more pronounced and the boundary-marking became more and more stringent.

But even before Grierson stabilized the meanings of linguistic terms in India the British considered Hindustani the lingua franca of India, H.T. Colebrook, an officer-scholar with much influence in India, commends the work of Gilchrist on the language:

> which is used in every part of Hindustán and the Dekhin; which is the common vehicle of colloquial intercourse among all well-educated natives, and among the illiterate also in many provinces of India, and which is almost everywhere intelligible to some among the inhabitants of every village (Colebrook 1808: 223).

However, although considered an all-India language in a country where the majority of the population was Hindu, it is associated with Muslims and is often called 'Urdu'. Monier Williams writes in his grammar.

> Urdú or Hindústaní is the mixed and composite dialect which has resulted from the fusion of Hindí, the idiom of the Hindús, with the Persian and Arabic of the Musalmán invaders. It is not only the regular spoken language of Delhi, Lucknow and at least fifty millions of persons in Central India, the North West Provinces and the Punjáb, but is also the common medium of communication between Musalmans throughout all India (Williams 1871: 1).

J.B. Gilchrist, the pioneer of Hindustani studies among the British in India, differentiates it from 'Hinduwee' as follows in his grammar.

The proper Hinduwee is, like European languages, the reverse of
Persian, being written and read from left to right, in a character
called *Naguree ....* Before the Moosulmans established themselves,
their letters and religion, with fire and sword in this country, the
Naguree was to India, what the Roman alphabet is now to Europe
(Gilchrist 1796: 4).

The British generally wrote in both the Perso-Arabic and the
Devanagari scripts. However, as mentioned with reference to
both the missionaries and the officials, they had a mental
distinction between Hindi and Hindustani. The former was
associated with the Hindus; the latter with the Muslims. For the
latter, the terms Urdu and Rekhta are also used. The normal
understanding of this dialect is summed up by a British writer
as follows:

There are two main dialects, that of the Hindus called *Hindi,*
abounding in Sanskrit words, and that of the Musalmans called Urdu,
abounding in words and phrases from the Arabic and Persian (Green
1895 Vol. 1: 3).

Green uses the Urdu script for Meer Amman's *Bāgh-ō-Bahār*, a
text in Urdu taught to the British, but there are verses in the
Devanagari script (Ibid., 203) and words now associated with
Hindi are used: *turant* (immediately), *mānas* (person), *jal* (water),
sundar (beautiful), *pūt* (son), and *kaniyā* (girl/daughter). There are
exercises in the Devanagari script but most of the work is in the
Urdu one (Ibid., 'Appendix', p. 1).

Because it was associated with the Muslims, the British wrote
it in the Perso-Arabic (Urdu) script. Apart from the *Bāgh-ō-Bahār*
which has been mentioned above, the British taught it through
other texts produced by the Indian Muslim civilization. Platts for
instance, draws upon other texts of Muslim cultural origin:
Fasānā-ē-Ajāib, The Shōlā-ē-Tūr of Kanpur, the *Aligarh Institute
Gazette* and the *Urdū Reader* (Platts 1920: ix). Gilchrist himself

mostly uses the Urdu script and the frontispiece of his grammar has the following couplet in the same script:

> *Maẽ Hazrat-ē-Saudā kō sunā bōltē yārō*
> *Allāh hī Allāh kē kyā nazm ō bayān haē*
> (I heard the honourable Sauda speaking
> O God! What poetry; what eloquence there was!) (Gilchrist 1796: 1)

Although the passages in the Devanagari script are very few, it was taught and is used in the books on grammar.

Likewise, Shaikh Imam Baksh Sahbai prepared an anthology of twelve Urdu poets called *Intikhāb-ē-Davāvīn* for use in Delhi College in which both the words, 'Hindoustany Poets', as well as 'Hindi verse' have been used (Naim 2006: 179). All the poems in it are in Urdu written in the Perso-Arabic script. Yet, as was the linguistic fashion of the times, they could be called Hindi, Hindustani, Rekhta, and Urdu.

By the time Grierson was carrying out his monumental linguistic survey of India, associations of language with religion were accepted by those who ruled India. Accordingly he made two recordings of 'The Prodigal Son': the Urdu form (of Hindustani) read out by a Muslim called Baqir Ali; the Hindi form read out by Babu Gauri Shankar Gupta (Grierson 1885–1933). In short, the British perceptions of the distinct identities of Hindus and Muslims helped to associate language with religion weakening the perception that a composite language could be shared between the two communities.

By the early twentieth century, both the India-wide character of Hindustani and its division into two varieties, a Muslim and Hindu one, were articles of linguistic faith. Thus Chapman, writing a textbook on Urdu for examinations, writes:

> Hindustani, the *lingua franca* of India, is a composite language, derived from Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian. It has several recognized

varieties of which the principal are Urdu and Hindi (Chapman 1907: 1).

R.P. De, writing at about the same time, calls it the 'lingua franca of India', and while recognizing the Muslim and Hindu varieties, says that both commonly go 'under the name of Hindustani' (De 1904: 1). John T. Platt, in his grammar, calls it Urdu:

> Urdu, or Hindustani, though a composite language is derived mainly from the Hindi. The Persian and Arabic languages have contributed largely, but Hindi is the chief source (Platts 1920: 1).

In short, the British considered Hindustani the lingua franca of the whole of India and not just North India and such centres of Urdu literature as Hyderabad (Deccan). It is arguable, however, that the number of people who understood the language outside the urban centres of North India and the Deccan, was probably far fewer in 1757, the beginning of British rule, than in 1947, its end. The British perception became reality because they used it in the army, in the schools and courts of North India and brought in modernity with its improved and new means of communications: trains, cars, buses, and later planes. The printing press, the radio and later film also spread in Hindustani. It spread more because of British rule than it ever had before. Even in far off West Punjab, now part of Pakistan, the term Hindustani was used in 1346/1927–28—at a time when the term Urdu too was widespread—for the language used by a Sufi who is otherwise Punjabi-speaking: '*bāz auqāt bazubān-ē-Hindustānī nēz natq mīnamūdand*' (sometimes spoke in the Hindustani language [in addition to the Punjabi of Maharan] because his sufi mentor used Hindustani and he himself 'spent a lot of time in India' [*basiār muddat dar Hindustān aqāmat kardā and*]) (Ruknuddin 1928: 47). And it was here that the famous mystic and poet of Siraiki, Khwaja Ghulam Farid (1845–1901), produced an Urdu *divān* with '95 ghazals and a few minor poems' (Shackle in Shackle 1991: 79).

In short, the British first thought it was the common language of India and then actually made it almost that.

Their other perception, that it was closer to Urdu than Sanskritized Hindi, fed into the Hindi-Urdu controversy of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This, however, is a subject requiring such exclusive treatment that it has been left out here (see Rai 1984; King 1994). Suffice it to say that it was partly because of this association that identity-conscious Hindus did not adopt it as the language of the independent Indian Union opting for (Sanskritized) Hindi instead.

The British used Hindustani and Urdu interchangeably but Hindustani seemed to push out Hindi and inclined towards the Urdu end of the linguistic scale. Indeed that is why Sulaiman Nadvi, who wanted peaceful coexistence among Hindus and Muslims, advised Muslims to abandon the name Urdu in favour of Hindustani. He considered the common language of both Muslims and Hindus as deserving of that name—symbolic as it was of Indian nationalism and Hindu–Muslim unity—because Urdu, after all, was only a recent name for the language (Nadvi 1939: 74 and 101–104). But precisely because it invoked 'Hindi', the more politically conscious Muslims did not like it either. Z.A. Bukhari, an important official and pioneer of radio in India, says that one could have used the language if it had 'a dictionary or if it had literature in it. Then one could have said, all right let us accept this language. But how can we use this hypothetical language which has no literature, no lexicon, no father nor any mother...' (Bukhari 1966: 120). Such identity-conscious Muslims obviously could not accept 'Hindi-Hindustani' for the language but they also rejected the term 'Hindustani' during the Urdu-Hindi controversy. In any case, precisely because it symbolized a common Indian nationality—something which ceased to exist in 1947—it did not survive the partition of British India.

Hindustani after the Partition

After 1947 Hindustani was ousted from both India and Pakistan. The former chose the name Hindi and the latter Urdu. In both countries this compromise appellation was seen as an artificial construction and, at best, a compromise among the would-be unifiers of the Hindi-Urdu controversy period.

The debate on using the name Hindustani or Hindi started on 12 September 1949, in the Constituent Assembly of India, and instead of the Gandhian compromise formula of accepting the name Hindustani and allowing it to be written in both the Perso-Arabic and the Devanagari scripts, the following resolution was tabled:

> The official language of the Union shall be Hindi in the Devanagari script and the form of numbers to be used for official purposes of the Union shall be the international form of Indian numerals (LAD: I IX; 32; 1949: 1321)

The debate was long and bitter. Hindu and Muslim members of the house stood in the opposite camps of Hindi and Urdu. Qazi Syed Karimuddin said that this could be a reaction to Pakistan's adoption of Urdu as its national language (Ibid., p. 1367). Abul Kalam Azad supported the compromise of Hindustani (Ibid., 1456). Even the members from South India supported this compromise term but they were overruled by people like Seth Govind Das, R.V. Dhulekar and Purushottam Das Tandon, all fanatical about Sanskritized Hindi and suspicious that Urdu would sneak in under the cover of Hindustani, and on 15 September 1949 the resolution was adopted.

While in India Muslims struggle to keep the word Urdu alive so that it would not be subsumed under Hindi as one of the styles or varieties of that language; in Pakistan some nationalists have suggested that the language be called 'Pakistani'. Linguists, wishing to emphasize the similarities between ordinary Urdu and

Hindi, as used at present in South Asia, call it Urdu-Hindi. A Hindi movie, fully understood in Pakistan, is nevertheless said to be in Hindi. Likewise, Pakistani dramas are said to be in Urdu in Pakistan even though speakers of Hindi comprehend them easily.

Sanskritized Hindi

The name used for the language of modern India roughly from about 1802 by excluding words of Arabic and Persian from Khari Boli Hindi is called just Hindi nowadays. However, in order to distinguish it from the earlier language of this name—also from the varieties of the collectivity called Hindi as used in the Hindi belt of India—some scholars call it Sanskritized Hindi, Modern Hindi and 'Hindi' (Rai 2001: 15). Its creation has been described by Vasudha Dalmia (1997), King (1994) and Alok Rai (2001: 79–92). The consensus among scholars is that Khari Boli was purged of words of Perso-Arabic origin and written in the Devanagari script in *Prēm Sāgar* by Lallu Ji Lal as a pioneering work of what later became Modern or Sanskritized Hindi (Jalili 2002). Others such as Sadal Misra in his *Batiyāl Pachīsī* also created the first paradigmatic texts of this language. Of course Insha Allah Khan Insha (1756–1818), who also wrote *Rānī Kētakī Kī Kahānī* (Insha *c*. 1803) in just such a language is not counted because he did it to show off his linguistic skill and was not serious about eliminating the Perso-Arabic diction which was symbolic of Muslim conquest and cultural hegemony for Hindu language activists. But the Hindus were not the only ones to Sanskritize Khari Boli Hindi. The British did it too. For instance, J.T. Thompson published his *A Dictionary in Hindee and English Compiled from Approved Authorities* (1846) and replaced a large number of Perso-Arabic words with Sanskrit equivalents. Even earlier (1785) William Kirkpatrick, the Persian Secretary to the Commander-in-Chief, had given the idea of preparing a Hindi dictionary but nothing had come out of it (Steadman-Jones 2007: 75; Bayly 1996:

296). For the lexicographers, the Sanskrit words were an index of their scholarship and the fact that there was a linguistic category called Hindi in the Devanagari script, of which they were producing a reference dictionary, made them hunt with the zeal of the purist for Sanskrit words. Their assumption was that their job was to restore words which the Muslim languages had driven out. But the words they substituted for these familiar ones were not intelligible.

The charge that this new language is not intelligible without specialized training is well-known. The language, or rather the style, is not meant to be intelligible, however. It is an identity symbol and its function is iconic—to evoke Hindu nationalism, help imagine a united land (Bharat) and a monolithic people united through the emotive symbols of land, language and creed. That is why it was pushed through the legislative assembly of India in 1949 with enthusiasm bordering on fanaticism as described earlier.

This language has created a diglossic situation in North India because it is nobody's mother-tongue. Instead, like Classical Arabic and Greek, it has to be learned in school. And, indeed, it is a difficult language to acquire as Alok Rai observes:

> there is the universal dread of 'school Hindi', in school and out of it. The large numbers of students who fail in Hindi in the Hindi belt itself are grim testimony to the fact that 'Hindi' has robbed them of their mother tongue. From being native users, free to invent and be creative, they have been 'second-languaged', disabled, rendered alien (Rai 2001: 105).

The real problem, however, is that the name Hindi, appropriated by this politically constructed language, makes it difficult to claim the shared past of both modern Urdu and Hindi, which remains unknown and unacknowledged in both Pakistan and India. Moreover, the unintelligible Sanskritic words make it difficult for ordinary people to believe that linguists claiming

that Urdu and Hindi are the same language could be right. So, in the last analysis, the divisive forces of the establishments on both sides stand to gain, as the message which emerges is that Hindi and Urdu, and thus Hindu and Muslim civilizations, are so alienated from each other as to warrant the official narratives of 'two nations', alien *malicchas* and strangers sharing common space or borders. Names like Hindustani would have given hope of emphasizing commonalities and the historical memories attached to that name are not antagonistic or bitter. But, then, the logic of a century and a half of the mobilization of linguistic identities in North India dictated otherwise. We reaped what we sowed.

Names and the Census

The politics of language is facilitated by discursive practices which include naming, classification and categorization, and of course, the use of these categories in the domains of power. Benedict Anderson, while describing the rise of nationalist ideology in the colonies of the Western powers, wrote that the three institutions which played a major role in constructing or 'imagining' the new 'nation' were, 'the census, the map and the museum: together, they profoundly shaped the way the colonial state imagined its dominion' (Anderson 1983: 163–64). The identities created, or at least made salient by the census, became the new political realities of the day in South East Asia which is Anderson's focus.

In India the census played an important role by creating the categories of Urdu, Hindi and Hindustani and enumerating the numbers of people who gave the corresponding label to their mother-tongue. This created assumed bodies of speakers out of those who might not have given their mother-tongue any name at all, as according to the census authorities, the 'average native rarely knows the name of his own dialect' (Census-I 1903: 250).

The first census report, that of 1871–72, elaborates upon religious categories as they were the most prominent part of the British classificatory discourse but language is also mentioned. Thus we are told that the area reported upon has a population of 190,563,048 people out of which the Hindus are the majority (139,248,568), followed by Muslims (40,882,537), after whom are Sikhs (1,174,436), and then the followers of minority religions (Census-I 1875: 16 and Table 17 of Appendix). The languages are reported to be 'Hindustani' in Bihar in both the Perso-Arabic and the Kaithi scripts and Hindi in the Chota Nagpur area in the Devanagari script (Census-I 1875: 69). At this time the British did not rule the Hindi-Urdu heartland—present-day UP—so Urdu does not even figure in this report.

The next census, that of 1881–1882, does not give figures for Urdu either, but does give figures for Hindi (517,989) and Hindustani (82,497,168). The census does, however, make it clear that Urdu is included under the category of 'Hindustani'. It says 'the language which is returned as numbering most speakers is Hindustani or Urdu' (Census-I 1883: 196). Further, the report asserts that Hindi speakers have been included among the Hindustani ones because although it 'is a distinctly separate language from Hindustani', it has not been distinguished from it in 'the North Western Provinces and Oudh' (43,221,705 speakers of Hindustani) (Census-I 1883: 196). This region, as we know it, is now called the home of Hindi, but it is also the centre of Urdu literature and high culture and the urban people here still speak a language which could be called popular Hindi-Urdu.

The 1891 census gives the number of Urdu-speakers as 140 per 10,000 of the population while the corresponding figures for Hindi are 3,269. The census also says that 'the language of the plains [NWP and Oudh] is officially "Hindustani", so it is not likely that any attempt would be made through the medium of the census to contravene this authoritative decision' (Census-I 1893: 138). This 'Hindustani', it is further explained, has 'a few

conventional terminations to the local vocabulary, with the introduction of some Persian words' (Census-I 1893: 134)—which, in fact, is ordinary, spoken Urdu also. By the 1901–1902 Census the Urdu-Hindi controversy had entered the consciousness of the census officials as well as the people. This report, for instance, associates Urdu explicitly with Islam as follows:

> Islam has carried Urdu far and wide, and even in Bengal and Orissa we find Mussalman natives of the country whose vernacular is not that of their compatriots but is an attempt (often a bad one) to reproduce the idiom of Delhi and Lucknow (Census-I 1903: 249).

Urdu is included in Western Hindi (40,714, 925 speakers) which is described as being spoken between 'Sirhind in the Punjab and Allahabad in the United Provinces. On the north it extends to the foot of Himalayas, but on the South it does not reach much beyond the valley of the Jamna, except towards the east, where it covers Bundelkhand and a portion of the Central Provinces' (Census-I 1903: 328). The census report goes on to name the dialects of this language: 'Hindustani, Braj Bhāshā, Kanaujī, and Bundīlī, to which we may add the Bangarū of the South-Eastern Punjab' (Ibid., 328).

The numbers of the speakers for each of these dialects is as listed:

Vernacular Hindostani	7,072,745
Dakhni	6,292,628
Other Hindostani including unclassed dialects	5,921,384
Braj Bhasha	8,380,724
Kanauji	5,082,006
Bundeli	5,460,280
Bangaru	2,505,158
Western Hindi	40,714,925
Source: Census-I 1903: 328.	

The census uses the term Hindustani, as it explicitly states, in two meanings: for the sum total of the dialects of what it calls 'Western Hindi' and (2) 'as the well-known literary language of Hindostan and the *lingua franca current* over nearly the whole of India' (Ibid., 329). However, it goes on to distinguish this language from Urdu which it defines as 'that form of Hindostani which is written in the Persian character, and which makes a free use of Persian (including Arabic) words in its vocabulary' (Census-I 1903: 330).

In short, the British writers of the census reports had arrived at a definition of Urdu which the Muslim intelligentsia agreed with and which makes Urdu a Muslim cultural product. And, at least partly because of it, Urdu was seen as a part of Muslim separatist nationalism. Had Urdu been defined as Hindustani, as is defined here—'the well-known literary language and *lingua franca* of almost the whole of India'—it would have encouraged conciliatory attitudes among the Muslim and Hindu elites, which could have joined in regarding it as a legacy of their composite, urban culture.

The British classificatory labels of Western and Eastern Hindi were not 'returned as mother-tongues in any census ever since 1891. In 1901 and subsequent censuses, the numbers of returns put against Western Hindi or Eastern Hindi were at best estimates and the figures were always adjusted' (Census-I 1964: cciii).

The politics of the classificatory labels for Hindi, Hindustani and Urdu kept changing according to the Hindu-Muslim politics of the period. It was decided, therefore, to use the term Hindustani only for the spoken language, not the script, only in UP which meant that the term Urdu disappeared (Census-I 1933: 356). This annoyed the Muslims but the census report assumes that Urdu refers to script not language (Ibid., 356). In 1941 the language and script questions were not tabulated (Census-I 1943: vi–vii).

After independence the census of 1951 says that, in contrast to the past 'the pendulum now swings the other way and speakers of Urdu have declined from 699,523 in 1941 to 131,600 in 1951 whereas over the same period the speakers of Hindi have increased from 67,988 to 652,722' (Census-MP 1954: 74). The same phenomenon was evident in Madhya Pradesh and Bhopal, the former Urdu-speaking areas, where the 'vast majority of speakers of various dialects of Hindi and Rajasthani...returned Hindi' (Census MP 1954: 73).

Basically, the neutral term Hindustani declined as Hindu and Muslim identities became rigid and focused upon language—Hindi and Urdu respectively—in addition to religion. The rising period for Hindustani was between 1911 and 1921 when speakers of Urdu and Hindi reverted back to being speakers of Hindustani. Between 1921–31 and 1931–1951, Hindi gained at the expense of Hindustani. After 1949 as we have noted, Hindustani speakers decreased very rapidly. During 1951–1961, however, 'Hindustani's loss became Urdu's gain'. However, the census report was unsure 'whether Urdu was slightly inflated either on its own or at the expense of some other tongue in 1961 (Census-I 1964: vi–vii).

However, Hindustani declined till it was not even recorded after 1961 and Urdu was relegated to the status of a minority language. The following figures given in percentages illustrate this:

Urdu in Present-day India (1971–2001)		
Year	Urdu	Hindi
1971	5.22	36.99
1981	5.25	38.74
1991	5.18	39.29
2001	5.01	41.03
Source: Census-I 2001: Statement-5, p. 14.		

In UP, once the home of Urdu, 7.99 per cent of people claim it as a mother-tongue, while 91.32 claim Hindi to be their mother-tongue (Ibid., Statement 9, pp. 20–37). The strength of Urdu versus Hindi in other areas of India is as follows:

Distribution of 10,000 Persons by Language		
	Urdu	Hindi
Bihar	1,141	7,312
Uttar Pradesh	799	9,133
Delhi	632	8,100
Uttaranchal	586	8,803
Madhya Pradesh	197	8,732
India (whole)	502	4,110
Source: Census-I 2001. Statement-3, p. 12.		

In keeping with the official discourse of secularism, the tendency to link language with religion is discouraged. During the 1991 census, for example, the enumerators were told: 'You should also not try to establish any relationship between religion and mother tongue' (Census-UP 1996: 2). However, the classificatory labels used by the census authorities and as they are understood in India and Pakistan do tend to associate languages with religious communities. For instance, even in the census of 1961 in India, the meaning of Urdu is restricted to what may be called 'Persianized' or 'High' Urdu. It is differentiated from the spoken language of urban India in the Census of 1961 as follows:

(a) Literary Hindostani was the vernacular of Musalmans and the form of polite speech of India generally (it may be renamed 'Hindustani' only) (article b).
(b) Urdu was that special variety of literary Hindostani which had excessive use of Persian words and was written in Persian character (article c).

In other words, it is by not recognizing the speech of ordinary urban people as 'Urdu', not even Muslims who are otherwise said to speak Urdu, that this language is restricted to a small, elitist Muslim preserve. An alternative view, and one which is favoured by the present author is that the language defined as 'Hindi' could equally be called 'Urdu' and vice versa. This definition is as follows:

(a) Vernacular Hindostani was the speech in Northern Doab and the contiguous areas by the inhabitants as their vernacular. (To avoid confusion this could be better known as "Hindi") (Census-I 1964: Article a, ccxi).

If this is the language of the streets of North India then it is quite intelligible to the speakers of Urdu (both as a first and a second language) in the cities of Pakistan. The sum total of these varieties may be seen as forming a continuum which may be given any name—Urdu, Hindi, Hindustani, or Urdu-Hindi—but it is basically the same language.

URDU

As mentioned earlier, this name was used for the language for the first time by the poet Mushafi in 1780 or so (Fauqi 2003: 806). However, some scholars, notably Syed Abdullah, claim that it was used first by Sirajuddin Ali Khan Arzu 1099–1169/1688—1756–57 in his book *Navādir ul Alfāz*, finished in 1165/1751 (Abdullah 1951: 28–29). Some even claimed that Mir Mohammad Husain Ata Khan Taehsin's book called *Naō Tarz-ē-Murass'ā*, written around 1193/1779, may be the first instance of such use in print. However, Taehsin's book, a translation from Persian of the tale of the four mendicants (*chahār dervish*), in 'colourful and embellished Hindi language' ('*ibārat rangīn zubān-ē-Hindī*) is meant to teach 'the language of the exalted city' (*zubān-ē-Urdū-ē-mu'allā*) (Taehsin 1775: 54). So, even if the writing of the book

predates the usage of the term by Mushafi, it cannot be said with certainty that Taehsin used the term Urdu for the language. Most probably he adhered to the conventional use of the term for the city of Delhi.

The claim about Arzu is, however, more serious. This theory was first advanced, although only in passing, by Hafiz Mahmud Shirani (Shirani 1941 in 1965: 51). It was reasserted but without reference to Shirani by Syed Abdullah, who advanced it in the preface to the *Navādir ul Alfāz* by giving examples of Arzu's explanations, or actually corrections of Mir Wase Hanswi's meanings in his *Gharaib-ul Lughāt*, of the words: '*rajwāṛā*', '*gazak*', '*nakhtōṛ ā*' and '*haṛaphnā*' (Abdullah 1951: 28–29). While in the first three the interpretations of the word Urdu is most likely not used in the meaning of language (see Arzu's explanation in Persian in Chapter 5 of this book), in the last case the Persian lines read: '*haṛaphnā... zubān-ē-Urdū ō aehlē shaherhā nīst ...*' (Arzu 1751: 441–442) translates as 'the language of Urdu and the inhabitants of the cities is not'. The word Urdu, which is normally used for city during this period, at least in writing, is probably still being used for Delhi. However, Abdullah takes it as referring to the language. While the usage here is ambiguous the actual date matters less than the fact that the word Urdu came to replace earlier terms for the language, sometime by the end of the eighteenth century.

As the word itself is Turkish and means camp or military cantonment, the most commonly believed theory in South Asia is that the language was born in military camps. This is only partly true because the language has an ancestor which existed in India even before the Muslims arrived. Moreover, even more than the camps, the market place, the *khānqāhs* of the Sufis and, indeed, the exigencies of daily life, made people borrow words from Persian and Arabic, the languages of Muslims, into the ancestor of both Hindi and Urdu. It is, however, true that cantonments do establish the power and, hence, the culture and

artefacts of the conquering power. As such, the act of borrowing the idiom associated with such places may have been faster than the rural areas of India.

While there is no clear example of the language of the military camps of pre- and even Mughal India, there are examples of the British cantonments where English entered the Indian languages. For instance, in Kanpur, a military camp established by the British, several such terms are found. The word camp itself becomes '*kampū*' and '*kanp*', etc. (Ansarullah 1988: 147). The words '*bārak*' (barrack), '*agan bōt*' (steam boat), appeal, appellant, etc., among others, are described in Persian by Mir Ali Ausat Rashk in his dictionary called *Nafs ul Lughā* (Ansarullah 1988: 147–152). Pencil is defined in Persian as '*qalm-ē-surmā bashad kē angrēzã badã navīsand ō lughat-ē-angrēzī ast*' (a pen of kohl which the British use for writing and it is an English word) (Ibid., 152). Later everybody knew the meaning so well that such explanations were no longer required. Is this how Persian and Arabic words entered the ancestor of our languages? Probably—but the exact process is yet to be described fully.

But the connotation of the name Urdu—military, Muslim conquests—cast a sombre shadow over Hindu-Muslim relations in British India. That is why those Muslims who emphasized peaceful coexistence with Hindus in a United India pointed out these associations (military domination and Muslim rule) and wanted the name to be abandoned (Nadvi 1939: 103). The logic which is advanced in support of this is that the word Urdu means 'camp' in Turkish. However, Shamsur Rahman Faruqi has given an excellent refutation of this. He first refers to 'a surreptitious feeling of guilt generated by the Urdu literary community's almost universal belief that Urdu was a "military language" after all' (Faruqi 2003: 818). He claims emphatically that 'there is no recorded instance of this word [Urdu] ever being used in the Urdu-Hindi-Rekhtah-Gujri-Dakhni language to denote "army"' (Faruqi 2003: 818). But the fact that the oldest name for Urdu was

Hindi is not acceptable to many Pakistani users of Urdu because they want to wipe out the Indian past of their language in favour of an exclusively Muslim (and military) past. In India it is the other way round. The name Hindi is now reserved for Sanskritized Hindi created in the nineteenth century so that Urdu appears to be an exclusively Muslim, hence foreign, cultural artefact. This weakens Urdu's position in India while associating it with Pakistan. But this is politics and not linguistic history—something which we will see very often in the case of Urdu.

COMPARATIVE TABLE FOR NUMBERS OF HINDI, HINDUSTANI AND URDU SPEAKERS 1911–1981

UP					
	1911	1921	1931	1951	1961
Hindi	43,769,569	-	-	50,454,217	62,442,721
Hindus-tani	-	49,384,073	49,456,327	6,742,938	10,530
Urdu	4,095,728	-	-	4,300,425	7,891,710
MP					
Hindi	8,203,278	7,651,334	2,868,538	19,875,774	21,686,140
Hindus-tani	79,291	28,907	4,990,345	59,381	1,084
Urdu	308,590	374,424	751,775	368,233	740,098
Punjab					
Hindi	1,670,023	1,641,267	-	-	11,297,838
Urdu	322,495	1,221,886	In 1931 Hindi includes Urdu so separate figures are not available	In 1951 the classificatory labels were Hindi, Urdu, Punjabi and Pahari.	255,660
Delhi					
Hindi	84,200	46,410	586,967	1,646,476	2,057,213
Urdu	90,345	309,000	-	-	153,247
Source: Census-I 1964, Statement–1.					

NB: The figures which are missing are not given in the source.

NOTES

1. The lines from Amir Khusrau's *Nuh Sipihr* are as follows:

سندی و لاهوری و کشمیری و کبر

دهور سمندری و تلنگی و گجر

معبری و گوری و بنگال و اود

دهلی و پیرا منشن اندر همه حد

این همه هندویست که ز ایام کهن

عامه بکار است بهر گونه سخن

(Khusrau 1318: 179–180)

Shamsur Rahman Faruqi does not accept Grierson's list of names of languages giving his own interpretation of them (Faruqi 1999: 63–64). However, his argument has no bearing on the points being made in this work.

2. The words of Abul Fazl are as follows:

درفر اخنای هندوستان بفراوان زبان سخن سرایند۔ آن اختلاف که از فهمیدگی یکدیگر باز ندارد

از شماره بیرون۔ وانچه نیارند دریافت دهلی بنگاله ملتان ماڑواڑ گجرات تلنگانه مرهٹ کرناتک

سند افغان شال (که میان سند و کابل و قندهار است) بلوچستان کشمیر

(Abul Fazl Vol. 3, 1590: 45).

3. Babar's words in the original Turkish are as follows:

غوزوب بیر هندوستانی بیلور کیشکا بویور دوم کیم بوسوز لارنی

بیرار بیرارالکا خاطر نشان

(Babar 1528: 415).

3

Age

How old is the ancestor of Hindi-Urdu? This question is difficult to answer because the surviving documents have only a few words which are recognizable but nothing is known about how they were spoken and whether the missing words, the ones which we do not understand, were in such a great majority that the descendants are too far removed from the ancestors to be classified under the same head.

Meer Amman, who is often quoted in defence of the idea that Urdu is a pidgin born during the middle Mughal period, traced the language back to the time of Akbar. His theory is that speakers of different languages came together in Akbar's capital (which was Agra, situated in the Braj Bhasha speaking area) and during buying and selling and trade (*lēn dēn saudā sulaf*) a language (Urdu) was created (Amman 1851: 11). This is the classical description of the creation of a pidgin language but even pidgins have a certain base language which this theory ignores. Thus every serious researcher, most notably Shirani (1965), have traced back the ancestor of Urdu to a spoken language at least as far back as the fourteenth century.

Amrit Rai, however, has quoted words and lines from the Nath-Panthi literature compiled in *Gorakh bānī* by Pitambar Datta Barthval (1942) which would shift the date back by about three centuries, i.e. from the fourteenth to the eleventh century, if it was authentic. However, it should be noted that the verses recorded as being of the Nath Panthis are from oral literature. The dates of the writing of manuscripts, which Barthval gives in

the introduction of his book, are from the sixteenth century onwards. In the case of Punjabi literature they are called 'a kind of folk translation'. Thus, while 'the verse line and the phrase remain more or less in their original forms, while older and archaic words are unintentionally changed into more familiar current idiom' (Rahul Sankrityayan quoted from Sekhon and Duggal 1992: 3) this is true for the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi also. Thus, the specimens accepted as being authentic by Amrit Rai (1984: 64–72) are to be taken as being approximations of an ancient form of Urdu-Hindi.

These texts are claimed by historians of Hindi alone though they belong to the common ancestor of both Hindi and Urdu. The following lines come from *Gorakh Bānī* have been transliterated and translated into English as follows.

Bastī na sunyē sunyē na bastī agam agōchar aēsā
(The Fullness is not zero; zero is not Fullness
He is such which cannot be known; nor perceived by the senses)

gagan si khar mahī bālak bolāē tākā nãv dharugē kaēsē
(From above the summit of the sky speaks the Absolute pure like a child—how will you name it?).

adēkhī dēkhibā dēkhī bechāribā adistī rākhiba chiyā
(The Unseen should be seen; the seen should be contemplated; And the Unseen should be kept in the consciousness)

pātāl kī gangā brahmand chaṛ ẖaibā tahā bimal bimal jal piyā
(Raise the [river] Ganga from the lowest level up to the highest, there to drink the clearest water).

ihã hī āchē ihã hī alōp ihã hī rachilaē tīnī trilōk
(Here is the Undestroyable, here is the mystically hidden and here the originally created three worlds)

āchaē sangaē rahaē juvā ta kāranṛ anant siddhā jēgēsrar huvā
(One who remains in companionship with the Absolute so because of it attains the endless perfection of the yogi).

vēd katēb nakhāṛ ī bāṛ ī sab dhankī talī āṛ ī
(Neither the Vedas nor other religious books nor the Word originating from its [four] sources reach the Absolute—all bring it under a cover).

gagni sikhar mahī sabd prakāsyā thā būjhaē alakh bināṛ ī
(The Word brings itself to light at the highest peak of the sky [Brahmand] and at that level one should realize the Unseen and the Unknown) (Barthwal 1942: 1–2).[1]

The following twenty-three words out of a total number of sixty-seven words (not counting repetitions) are intelligible to speakers of modern Urdu: *bastī* (as habitation not fullness); *aēsā* (of this kind); *gagan* (sky); *bōlē* (speaks); *nām* (name); *dhar* (to keep); *gē* (will as in *dharō gē* = will keep); *kaēsā* (of what kind); *dēkhī* (seen); *rakkhī* (kept); *kī* (of); *chaṛ h* (mount); *jal* (water); *piyā* (drank); *hī* (it is); *rachnā* (to be decorated; in visible splendour); *tīn* (three); *kitāb* (book); *na* (no); *sab* (all); *sang* (with); *huā* (happened); and *bujhē* (put off). The words *bichār* (think) *sabd* (word) and *kāran* (reason) are also intelligible to Urdu-speakers educated in the classics of India or those who are exposed to Bollywood movies and Indian TV. This leaves forty-one words which are known to specialists in Sanskrit. But, since this is a religious work, it probably has more words of Sanskrit—the language of religious and philosophical thought—than ordinary speech would.

Even better than the text quoted above is the following specimen of a deed of gift in one of the royal courts of Rajasthan.

Ō janānā mẽ thārī vansrā ṭ āl ō dūjō jāvēgā nahĩ ōr thārī baēthak dalī mẽ hī jī pramaṇō pardhan barōbar karaṇ dēvēgā.
(And in the harem you and your descendants can enter and no other. And your room will be near our secretary's (Pardhan's) office.[2]

This was written by Dube Pancholi Janaki Das in Anand Sam 1139 or 1172 CE. As one can see, words of Muslim languages have been used but what is more interesting is that the 'verbal forms are of a type, identical with those of Kharī Bolī viz. 'Javegā', 'Devegā' etc' (Vedalankar 1969: 4)

If this specimen is, indeed, of the twelfth century, then it indicates—far better than the lines from the *Gorakh Bānī* quoted earlier—that the ancestor of modern Hindi-Urdu was present before the Turks and the Afghans established their rule in North India.

The specimens provided earlier would not be intelligible to a non-specialist in Sanskrit and the Prakrits of India in the medieval age, but the same is true for old English texts from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries which are not intelligible to modern speakers of English.

It appears almost certain then that the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi was present in the eleventh century when the Persian-speaking Turkish and Persian invaders, merchants, mendicants, and holy men arrived in India. This ancestor (Proto Urdu-Hindi) was not a standardized language so it was spoken with major differences of vocabulary, pronunciation and other usages from around Peshawar to the end of Bihar. But it was probably in the area around Delhi that the language got most mixed up with Perso-Arabic diction, resulting in code-switching and then the stabilized forms we encounter in medieval documents. Code switching—changing from one language to another by speakers who are fluent in both—is a worldwide phenomenon and is evident in linguistic history. For instance, Richard Kyngston, dean of Windsor, wrote a letter to King Henry IV on 13 September 1403 in Norman French in which he switches to English as he probably did in conversation:

> Please a vostre tresgraciouse Seignourie entendre que a-jourduy après noone....Warfore, for goddesake, thinketh on ȝour beste frende...

This is translated in the footnote (no. 4) as follows: 'May it please your most gracious Lordship to understand that today after noon... Wherefore, for God's sake think of your best friend'...(quoted from Knowles 1979: 55).

But, besides actually switching back and forth in two languages, bilinguals also borrow words in their languages. For instance, in the above example the word 'noone' became the English 'noon' and so on. Nor was this all as a large number of collocations and expressions were borrowed from French into English. Some such process must have gone on into the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi. Examples of Urdu-Hindi in the making are illustrated in the letters of representatives of Hindu rulers in Mughal courts, 'in the form of *arzdasht* written in *Hindvi* incorporating the Rajasthani and Persian dialects' (Sharma 1987: 1). One such document from Vakil Pansholi Megharaj to Maharaja Bishan Singh dating from 6 January 1692 in the Devanagari script reads:

> *Mahārāj salāmat. Yāmae jū khātir mubārak mẽpasand āvē su arjdāst karaēlā. Fārsī arjdāst sitābī kē sabab nahī karī he. Jū navāb salāmat Khān Jī naē pharmāyā jū jald joṛ ī chalē jū. Jald smacharõ kī arjdāst karī hē* (Sharma 1987: 44).[3]
>
> (Great Ruler May you live long. If it pleases you I am sending this petition. I have not written the petition in Persian because of the hurry. Whatever Nawab Salamat Khan Ji has said that I have quickly conveyed to you. Quickly I have conveyed the news in this petition to you).

These documents suggest that the representatives of the Rajput rulers wrote normally in the Devanagari script but they could also write in the Persian script upon formal occasions though it took them longer to compose a letter in that script. Being in a Muslim court they had to use the vocabulary (salutations, courteous expressions, formal words in Persian for documents, etc.) of that court so that their language is very much like the

kind of hybrid English one finds in the English Factory documents
mentioned elsewhere. It is this process of intermingling in many
domains—business, diplomacy, bureaucracy, military, and
religious—which produced the common ancestor of Hindi and
Urdu in the medieval age in India.

There is evidence also that the ancestor of Hindi-Urdu, was
used informally by people. As mentioned earlier, this evidence
comes from the *malfūzāt* (for a synoptic survey of twenty-nine
books of this genre see Aslam 1995), *tazkarās,* histories and other
contemporary documents in Persian. Examples from this kind of
literature as well as other historical documents in Persian have
been quoted by Ghani (1929, 1930), Hafiz Mahmud Shirani (1965:
132–158), Syed Sulaiman Nadvi (1939: 19–75), Jamil Jalibi (1975:
21–50), Aslam (1995: 339–340), Askari (1995); and Jafer and Jain
(1998), as well as others who do not, however, seem to have used
the original Persian sources. These researchers concur that a
language called 'Hindi' or 'Hindvi' or in Gujarat 'Gojri' and also
'Gujarati' was used in informal conversation or spontaneously—
as when someone is hurt or surprised or is talking to people who
are not conversant with the formal Persian. It is also used in
songs (*samā'a*).

Unfortunately none of these researchers have commented
upon the relative credibility of the sources they have used to
reproduce the lines in what is often called 'Hindvi' and 'Hindi'.
Thus *tazkarās*, written in the nineteenth century, are used
without comment when reporting the words of a medieval saint
as are contemporary *malfūzāt*. The examples given here fall
under three main headings: those which mention a language
without, however, giving the actual words; those which are not
from contemporary sources and are, therefore, of doubtful
credibility; and finally, those from contemporary or near-
contemporary sources which give the actual words in the
language. First, however, let us mention the words of Hindi-Urdu
in the Persian documents.

Words

The presence of Urdu-Hindi words in the Persian documents of the medieval age are recorded very carefully and extensively by Hafiz Mahmud Shirani (1965: 54–101). It is not possible to add to this list. Suffice it to say that even the word *badhnī*, water pot, which is the nickname of Sheikh Badhni who lived in the thirteenth century, is because, according to the legend, he used to give water to prisoners. Thus 'he got the nickname of *badhnī* which in the 'Hindvi' language means a pot of water' ('*Shei<u>kh</u> Sufi rā badhnī [laqab uftād] kē bazubān-ē-Hindī kūza murād ast*') (Dehlavi 1862: 74).

Sentences in a Language called 'Hindvi' or 'Hindi'

As for the recording of utterances by previous researchers such as Ghani (1929 and 1930), Shirani (1930 in 1965: 132–158), Nadvi (1939: 19–75) and Jalibi (1975: 21–42), they do not differentiate between contemporary or near-contemporary and latter sources when recording the Hindi utterances attributed to medieval speakers. Some sources mention that so-and-so said something in the 'Hindvi' or 'Hindi' language but the words themselves are not actually quoted. For instance, the <u>Khair ul Majālis</u>, which is the *malfūzāt* of Sheikh Nasir Uddin Chiragh Dehli (1276–77–1356) (the manuscripts of 1649 have been used to prepare the book used here but the conversations actually took place and were written by Hamid Qalandar in the early fourteenth century) mentions Sheikh Badhni (mentioned above) who lived during the lifetime of Sheikh Farid (Assembly 48, Qalandar *c.* 14th century: 159). When he was told that he would not have to say his prayers in paradise he said that he had no use for such a paradise and 'said a word in the Hindvi language which it is not appropriate to repeat' (*lafzī guft bazubān-ē-Hindvī kē natawān guft*' (Ibid., 159). This is also repeated in a *tazkarā*, <u>Akhbār ul Akhiār</u>, written at a later date (Dehlavi 1862: 73).

Yet another example is that Khwaja Usman Harooni goes into a fire with a Hindu child who later says 'in the Hindvi language: 'I was sitting in the middle of a flower garden' (*bazubān-ē-Hindvī guft kē man darmiān bāgh nashistā būdam*) (Assembly 11, Qalandar *c*. 14th century: 54).

Quoting from *Latāif-ē-Quddūsī*, the *malfūzāt* of Sheikh Abdul Quddus Gangohi (860–945/1455–1538), written by his son Sheikh Ruknuddin, between 1537 and 1538, Aslam says that he spoke 'Hindi' and listened to songs in that language (Aslam 1995: 339). However, the actual words are not given.

Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya narrates the story of Sheikh Ahmad Nahravani who was a disciple of a certain Faqir Madhu—a name suggesting Hindu origin—who is said to be the leader of prayers at a mosque in Ajmer. This Madhu told Nahravani, whom he heard reciting Hindvi poetry, that he had a beautiful voice and he should not waste it on singing Hindvi songs (*darēgh bāshad kē surūd-ē-Hindī kharch kunī*) (Sijzi 1322: 764). Instead, the mentor advised him to recite the Quran. Again, Shirani (1965: 137) and other researchers assume that this was the ancestor of Urdu but it is not clear exactly which language is meant by 'Hindvi'. However, it is reasonable to assume that it would be a variety of Urdu-Hindi used in Ajmer.

Similarly, Sheikh Rizqullah Mushtaqi (1495–6–1581–2), the author of *Waqiāt-ē-Mushtāqi* (1572), tells us that Sher Shah Suri (r. 1540–45) had appointed separate clerks to write in Persian as well as 'Hindvi' (Mushtaqi 1572: 185). And, of course, we know from the *Āin-ē-Akbarī* (1590) that it was Raja Todar Mal, appointed minister (*Vakīl*) by Akbar in 990/1582, who changed the language of the accounts from Hindvi to Persian (Blochmann 1873: 377).

Unfortunately, the 'Hindvi' or 'Hindi' words are not reproduced in all the cases cited above. Thus, it cannot be said with certainty as to whether this was the ancestor of Urdu and Hindi which Shirani (1965: 54–131), as well as other researchers, assert it was.

Reasoning from the examples given below it probably was but one cannot be sure.

Sentences of Hindi in Sources of a Latter Date

According to the legend Sheikh Ahmad Nahravani, a weaver, was visited by Sheikh Hameed Uddin Nagori (590–673/1193–1274), his mentor. He was weaving and the Sheikh said 'Ahmad! How long will you remain bound to this profession' and left. Sheikh Ahmad stood up to fasten a loose nail, slipped, fell and broke his arm. The Persian words are: '*Shei<u>kh</u> Ahmad bazubān-ē-Hindvī guft yenī Qāzī Hameed Uddīn Nāgōrī dast-ē-man bashakist*' ('in the Hindvi language said Qazi Hameed Uddin Nagori broke my arm') (Assembly 99 in Qalandar *c*. 14th century: 276).

Another story quoted by both Ghani (1929: 72) and Shirani (1930 in 1965: 150) is of Syed Burhanuddin Abu Mohammad Abdullah Bukhari (d. 857/1453), who is famous for having uttered words in Hindi spontaneously when he struck a piece of wood one night after getting up for prayers. The Persian chronicler says*: 'bar zubān-ē-mubārak guzasht kē '<u>kyā haē lōhā haē kē lakṛ ī haē kē patthar haē</u>'* (from the blessed tongue burst forth 'what is it? Is it iron or wood or stone?' (Khan Vol. 3, 1889: 17).[4] But while this hagiography mentions a saint who died in the fifteenth century, it was actually published in 1306/1888–89. Thus it is not certain whether the words in Hindi were exactly these or not.

Sheikh Hameed Uddin Nagori, disciple of Sheikh Moinuddin Chishti (1141–1230), is said to have spoken 'Hindi' at home (Aslam 1995: 339). However, only a few words purported to be spoken by him survive (Shirani 1965: 136).

According to Khwaja Ghulam Farid (1845–1901), Nizamuddin Auliya was very fond of Hindi songs. Once a woman was singing inside the house and her voice reached the saint. The rest of the story is best told in the words of the writer of the *malfūzāt*. '*ĩ shē'rī guft: "<u>lagan bin raen nā jāgē kōī</u>" pas bar ĩ shē'r nēz āhazrat rā zauq rasīd ō bavajd āmadand*' (Ruknuddin 1928: 167) (sang this

[Hindi] couplet: '<u>without love nobody keeps awake the whole night</u>' so on hearing this couplet he reached ecstasy and fell into a state of exalted consciousness). But this conversation is recorded in the twentieth century so the actual words of the couplet may have been changed during the long history of its narration.

A saint whose name is Sheikh Mohammad but who is known as Mian Alulak got this title through an utterance in Hindvi attributed to Hazrat Shah Alam, a saint of Gujarat mentioned, in the third volume of the *Mirā 'at-ē-Ahmadī*, who died in 857/1453. The Persian chronicler says that Sheikh Mohammad was sitting outside his home when Shah Alam arrived. However, since he wanted him [Alam] to give him a title he did not respond to the visitor thrice when called by name. After the third time Shah Alam 'smiled and said: "O Mian Alulak why don't you speak?" ('*tabassum kanã farmūdand "<u>arē Miã Alūlak bōltē kyũ nahĩ</u>"*') (Khan 1889 Vol. 3: 81). This sentence in Urdu-Hindi is perfectly intelligible but it is found in a work of the nineteenth century though it purports to refer to medieval Gujarat.

Another source is a hagiography (*tazkarā*) called the *Jawāhir-ē-Farīdī* finished by Asghar Ali Chishti on the 3rd of Shawwal 1033/1623. Out of its 399 pages 272 are devoted mostly to the life of Sheikh Farid with anecdotes about other Chishti saints. It reproduces certain 'Hindi' utterances of the saint which have been quoted by all researchers as if they represented the language of the saint himself. However, because of the passage of nearly 175 years to the saint's death, all that we can be sure of is that these may be examples of early seventeenth century Urdu-Hindi in North India. The examples are:

'*dōhrā: Farīdā dhar sūli sar pinjrā taliã thukan kāg/Rab rajīvē bā hōrī tū dhan hamārē bhāg*' (Chishti 1623: 187).[5]
(Couplet: O Farid! Place the crucifix on the head of the cage and the dregs will be spit out by the crows. God fulfils others and that is our good luck).

While this couplet has not been used by most researchers, the conversation which all the researchers mentioned above, and many others have quoted uncritically, is from the same source. The story of Sheikh Farid, then a disciple of Sheikh Qutbuddin Bakhtiar Kaki (1173–1235), whose search for fire to heat the water for ablutions for his mentor leads him to the house of a beautiful prostitute who invites him to sleep with her. He refuses and she asks for his eye which he plucks out and gives her taking the fire in exchange. He then ties a cloth on the eye and attends to his mentor who asks him why he has tied his eye. The young Farid says 'in the Hindi language: "*ãkh āyī haē*". All these words are perfectly intelligible today and the expression literally means the 'eye has come' but also means 'the eye is inflamed or painful' even now. The Sheikh replies as follows: '*agar āyī haē ĩ rā chirā bastā aēd*' (if it has come why have you tied it up?). Thereupon Farid removes the cloth and the eye is fine. Part of the Sheikh's reply is also in Hindi and he too uses the punning word '*āyī*' (come) for being physically present as well as infected (Ibid., 208). Sheikh Farid is to have also said in the 'Hindi language: *Sarsā kabhī sarsā kabhī narsā*' (Sarsa [a sub-district in Bihar] sometimes populated sometimes not) (Chishti 1623: 275). Similarly he counts in Hindi-Urdu in response to a woman's question as to how many sons she would have. His words are: '*ēk, dō tīn chār panj haft*' (one, two, three, four, seven) (Chishti 1623: 360). Out of these words only the last one is in Persian.

In addition to the words in many sources mentioned above a number of Hindi-Urdu words such as '*bābā*' (father, old man) and '*bāp*' (father) are attributed to thirteenth century saints (Ibid., 360). While describing a marriage custom the word '*ghaṛ aōlī*' is mentioned (Ibid., 232) and the names of dry fruit are in this language: '*chilghōzā ō akhrōt ō narjīl ō pistā ō alāchī*' (pine nuts and walnuts and coconuts and pistachio and cardamom) (Chishti 1623: 273).

A source which has not been used by any of the researchers cited above is the *Waqiāt-ē-Mushtāqī* (1572) mentioned before in another context. Mushtaqi quotes a couplet by Sheikh Farid which has words we recognize as Hindi-Urdu and Punjabi:

> *Jit ghar zamīn nā pāē mabiā maban<u>dh</u>ī tat*
> *Chitu pardēsī pāhnā haē ō nahāē jat* (Mushtaqi 1572: 216).[6]
> (When one does not find habitation or a piece of the earth—or reality. Where does the foolish alien bathe?).

This is the language of the sixteenth, not the fourteenth century, since we find them in a source written during Akbar's reign.

However, even with this imperfect evidence it seems probable to assume that certain words of the local languages, especially Hindi-Urdu, had entered ordinary Persian discourse in India so much that they were used freely even in formal writing just as words of Urdu are used in Pakistani English nowadays.

Amir Khusrau (1253–1324)

Most of the researchers on Khusrau's work have concluded that the writings in Hindvi/Hindi attributed to him are not authentically his (Narang 1987; Sharma 2006:78). However, others credit him with so many writings that he is also called the father of Hindi as well as Urdu poetry (Sharma 2006: 81–83). Unfortunately no authentic manuscript source of a contemporary date is available to judge these claims.

Recently Gopi Chand Narang has referred to the Sprenger collection in Berlin which comprises the Hindi writings of Khusrau. The riddles certainly do contain words we now associate with Hindi—*Purkh* (men), *charnõ* (feet), *nār* (women), *ashnān* (bath), *bhōjan* (meal), etc.,—as do other works up to the eighteenth century, but the date (1763) on the manuscript is not the date of the writing. It is the date when Sprenger put it together from the library of the rulers of Awadh. As such, Narang's assertion

that there are no reasonable grounds for not accepting any of these works as originally Khusrau's is not viable (Narang 1987: 142). The problem is that the copyists introduced linguistic changes according to the fashion of the period in which they were copying the manuscripts. So, even if Khusrau did write some of the original lines, what we are reading now is the language of the eighteenth century. That Khusrau did write in Hindi cannot be denied in the face of his claim that he had distributed these writings among his friends quoted earlier.

He also boasted that he had a collection of verse in Hindui in addition to Persian. His words are:

> *Pēsh az ĩ az pādshāhān-ē-sukhan kisē rā saē dīvān nabūd magar ma rā kē Khusrau-e-Mamālik kalāmam. Mas'ud Sā 'ad Salmān ra agarchē hast ammā ĩ saē dīvān dar saē 'ibārat ast 'Arabī ō Pārsī ō Hinduī-dar Pārsī-ē-mujarrad kisē sukhan rā bar saē qism nakard juz man kē dar ĩ kār qassām-ē-'adilam'.* (Before this among the kings of poetry nobody had three collections of verse except I who is the exalted one of the realm of letters. Masood Saad Salman did, however, have three collections of verse in Arabic, Persian and Hindui. In Persian itself nobody has written verse in three styles except me and I am the judge of this kind of work) (Khusrau 1293: 63–64).

Khusrau made it clear that he was proficient in Hindi and proud to be an Indian Turk—his mother was Indian and he was brought up in his maternal grandfather's Indian household—as he says:

> *Turk-ē-Hindustāniam man Hinduī goēm javāb*
> *Shakkar-ē-Misrī nadāram kaz 'Arab goēm sukhan*
> (I am an Indian Turk and give reply in Hindi/the sugar of Egypt I do not have to speak in Arabic) (Khusrau 1293: 63).

Yet another couplet is:

> *Chū man tōtī-ē-Hindēm rāst pursī*
> *Zē man Hinduī purs tā naghz gōēm*

(Because I am a parrot of India if you ask me correctly/ask me in Hindui so that I give sweet answers) (Khusrau 1293: 63).

SENTENCES OF HINDI NEAR-CONTEMPORARY SOURCES

Now we come to near-contemporary sources with Hindi words or sentences. The following story is given in *Siyār ul Aulayā* by Kirmani (d. 1368–1369). The quotations given below have been taken to mean that Sheikh Farid could speak in the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi to people who were not fluent in Persian. However, what is more reasonable is to assume that during the fourteenth century, more than a century after the saint had died, this kind of language was spoken.

Sheikh Jamaluddin Hansvi (583/1177–78—659/1262) had a small son, Burhanuddin, who came to Sheikh Farid, after his father's death, with a maid servant, Madar-ē-Mominã. The Sheikh gave him all symbols of mentorship and *ijāzā*. Madar-e-Momina said in the Hindi language: '*Khōjā Burhanuddin bālā haē*' (Khoja Burhanuddin is a child). The Sheikh replied in the same language: '*ponõ kā chānd bhī bālā hōtā haē*' (the moon of the fourteenth night was also once small) (Kirmani *c*. 14th century: 193). This story is repeated in the latter work *Jawāhir-ē-Farīdī* with minor changes (Chishti 1623: 303).

In the same book a *dōhrā* is attributed to Sheikh Farid in a local Indian language which is probably the ancestor of Punjabi and Urdu-Hindi. It is: *kantā nahō hītan* (or *haetan*) *karu rī tākān hata manāē/bas kandlē madhan gar hōrī luhd khā* (Kirmani *c*. 14th century: 377).[7]

Sheikh Nizamuddin Auliya (1244–1325), the disciple of Sheikh Farid, understood Hindvi very well because the *Siyār ul Auliyā* mentions that he entered into a state of ecstasy when the heard a *Jikrī* whose words are given as follows: '*baenā bin bahājī aesā sukh saēn bāsūn*'.[8] These words in Hindvi, the author tells us in Persian, 'had an effect upon him' ('*ī Hindvī asar kard*' (Kirmani *c*. 14th century: 522). He also held a conversation with two sufis

who had come from Uchch in Sindh and 'they did not know Persian' (*īshān Pārsī namīdānand*) (Ibid., 584). His biographer, on the authority of manuscripts he had seen, has said that he preferred and loved 'Purbi songs' having passed his childhood and early youth in Badaon (Nizami 2007: 141 and 16–25).

The Actual Words

Now we come to examples of the actual words of the language which exist in some sources. One of these is what the <u>Khair ul Majālis</u> calls 'Hindvi'. Firstly, a slave girl asks a merchant whether she should bring him food as follows:

> shall I bring *nihārī*? He said wait a little. This he said in the Hindvi language and used the word "*raēh, raēh*" (*nihārī biāram? Guftī barī sabar kun, ĩ su<u>kh</u>an bazubān-ē-Hindvī farmūdand kē guftī kalmā "raēh, raēh*") (Assembly 27 Qalandar *c.* 14th century: 93).

The word *'raēh'* is used even now in Urdu and Hindi for 'stay', 'live', 'stay put', 'wait' and so on. At another place the Sheikh narrates the story of an idol worshipper who contracts high fever. So, placing his head on the feet of the idol, he begs him in 'Hindi'. '*Tū merā gusāĩ tū mērā kartār muj is tāp <u>thĩ</u> chadā*' (You are my Lord You are the one who does everything, save me from this fever'). The Persian source makes it clear that this was said in Hindi and was written as such (*ĩ alfāz bazubān-ē-Hindi farmūdand hamchunã navishtā shud*). The story continues that, upon receiving no response from the idol, he says, again in the same language: 'You are not the Omnipotent' (*tū kartār nāhĩ*). The story was understood and the hearers were so affected that they wept (Assembly 36, Qalandar *c.* 14th century: 123).

Yet another instance of the words of 'Hindvi' given in the <u>Khair ul Majālis</u> is the incident of Ali Maula who says about the young Nizamuddin in Badaun to another person in 'Hindvi': 'O

Maulana he will become old' (*arē Maulana! Yē budā hōsī*). Then he goes on to say: 'I have seen two things in him. One is as they say in the Hindvi language: "he who wears the turban he falls at somebody's feet" (*man dar ū dō chīzī mī bīnam-yakī ãst kē bazubān-ē-Hindvī guftand: "jō mundāsā bāndhē sō pãē pasrē"*') (Assembly 56. Qalandar *c.* 14th century: 191).

These lines are easily intelligible as mentioned above. However, that a man in Badaun in the Hindi belt should use the word '*hōsī*', used even now in Punjabi for 'will become', may be difficult to explain unless one assumes that the varieties of a large unstandardised language was spoken from Peshawar to the end of Bihar and this was the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi as well as Punjabi and other related languages.

The problem with these small sentences is that one cannot be sure whether they have not been modified later by the copyists (*kātibs*) since they are far too close to our present-day Urdu and Hindi than what we should expect. However, even discounting the sources which are not contemporary or near-contemporary there is enough evidence to suggest that the ancestor of Urdu and Hindi, whatever it was called, was actually used in many parts of North India including the Indian Guajarat and the Deccan, before Babar entered India in 1526. And, indeed, our example of an actual text of 'Hindi' in the Perso-Arabic script is from the Deccan.

This is the *Masnavī Kadam Rāō Padam Rāō* of Fakhar Din Nizami written between 1430 and 1435 and it is far less intelligible for the modern reader than the isolated utterances and phrases quoted above. It would suggest that either the literary idiom was more Sanskritized than ordinary speech or that Deccan used a more Sanskritized variety of the language than the north. The diction of this book is not only Sanskritic but is also obsolete so that it is only through Jamil Jalibi's glossary that one may understand the book. This book was written in the Deccan, so that may be the reason for its alienation from the North Indian

reader who appears to have borrowed and built upon a North Indian linguistic tradition rather than the Dakhni one. One reason for asserting this is that Bayazid Ansari's (1526–1574) book _Khairul Bayān_ (1560), written in what is now the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province of Pakistan, is much more intelligible than the _Masnavī_. True that there are about 140 years between the two texts but still the diction of this book is remarkably intelligible. Examples from both these texts are given in the chapter on the identity of Urdu and need not detain us here. It is to be noted, however, that probably the first specimen of ancient Urdu-Hindi writing available, are the legal documents in the Devanagari script from the Rajput courts—assuming that they do go back to the twelfth century as claimed by scholars (Vedalankar 1969: 4) quoted earlier. In Perso-Arabic script the _Khair-ul-Bayān_ is probably the first specimen of Urdu-Hindi prose extant since it is almost certain that Sheikh Gesu Daraz left no authentic work in any variety of this language (Jain in Jafer and Jain Vol. 2, 1998: 282–325) and that Burhanuddin Janum's _Kalmatul Haqāeq_ was written in 990/1582 (Ibid., 357–362).

In this context it is instructive to look at the works of Kabir Das (1440–1518). He was brought up in a weaver's house in Benares and it is not clear whether he was a Hindu or a Muslim. Unfortunately, he did not leave behind authentic manuscripts of his verse, so that what is now attributed to him is from the oral tradition.

Kabir composed verses in old Avadhi, Dingal (old Rajasthani), Braj Bhasha, and like the Muslim Sufis, 'the old Hindui dialect, mixed with Panjabi and Arabic-Persian vocabulary' (Vaudeville 1993: 113). However, the local language around Benares and its neighbourhood is Bhojpuri which is spoken from Eastern UP to West Bihar and up to the Himalayas. However, Kabir's language— or at least that which is attributed to him—is a hybrid—an eclectic language with a wider intelligibility than a regional variety could have. Indeed, according to Vaudeville, 'the language

of the aristocratic Khusrau, like that of the poor Julāhā Kabīr, must have been basically the same: good old Hindui, the language of the bazaar, though the language of the heart may still have been Avadhi' (Vaudeville 1993: 124)

The verses now available to us are as follows:

Sāhīb mērā ēk haē dūjā kahā na jāē
Dūjā sahib jō kahū sahib kharā rasāē
(I have one Master; another I cannot own
If I acknowledge another one, the real one will be displeased) (Avadh 2006: 25).

Another one is:

Khush khānā haē khīchrī mũ par atak nūn
Mānas parāyā khāē kē garā katāvē kaõn
(I enjoy eating rice-and-lentil with a bit of salt)
Who would eat other people's meat and get his neck cut off) (Avadh 2006: 152).

Another book, and this time in Khari Boli which was standardized into both modern Urdu and Hindi is Gang Kavi's (1518–1617) *Chand Chhandrōnan ki Mahmā* (1603). The author is said to be a friend of Abdul Rahim Khan-e-Khanan (Jain in Jafer and Jain Vol. 2, 1998: 270; Snatak 1999: 213). Yet another book, called the *Ajē Chand Nāmā* by Aje Chand Bhatnāgar, written in 960/1553 in the Khari Boli of Sikandarabad in the Buland Shehr area near Delhi, has the following verse. '*Khāliq jin jag paēdā kiyā rāziq, sab kõ bhojan diyā* (The Creator who created the world; the Giver of sustenance, who gave food to everybody) (Quoted from Jain in Jafer and Jain Vol. 1, 1998: 440).

Although there are words referring to Hindu mythology, culture and religious concepts, these are also to be found in the *Masnavī Kadam Rāō Padam Rāō.* Indeed, the very fact that the language is so intelligible, makes one suspect that it is not the

language of the early fifteenth but that of the early sixteenth century.

Sur Das (1478 or 79–1581 or 84), whose work is reproduced as part of Hindi renaissance in 1881 by Munshi Natthu Ram, writes in a much more intelligible language.

> *Āpē purkh āpē nārī....āp pitā āpē hī*
> *Mātā...āpē pandit āp giānī... āpē*
> *Rājā āpē rānī...āpē dhartī āp akāsā...*
> (himself man himself woman; himself father himself mother; himself learned man himself student; himself king himself queen; himself earth himself sky) (Das n.d.: 52).

This text is perfectly intelligible though most of the words now belong to the register of Hindi rather than Urdu. On the other hand, the Sanskritized Hindi of the author (Natthu Ram) is not intelligible to a speaker of Urdu (Ibid., 202) because, unlike the above words which were shared for centuries, the Sanskritic ones were borrowed only recently.

It is not clear to what extent this language had penetrated different sections and strata of society up to the Mughals. Babar (1483–1530) did not know the language he calls 'Hindustani' in 1526 because he got his Persian translated into the language for a Lodhi chief as has been mentioned in another context earlier (Babar 1528: 459). However, he must have picked up some of its vocabulary later because the manuscript of his Turkish *Dīvān* in the Rampur Raza library has the following couplet by him:

> *Mujkā na huā kuj havis mānk ō mōtī*
> *Fuqara halighā bas lolghū sedur bānī ō rōtī* (Babar n.d.).
> (I have never had lust for jewels and pearls
> The mendicants only require water and bread)

The first line is almost all in the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi and the second also has words like '*bānī*= water' and '*rūtī*=bread' which are used even now but the other words are in Turkish.

Humayun (r. 1530–1556), Babar's son, does not seem to have known the language because when he heard a parrot repeating the lines: 'read Rumi Khan is a villain read Rumi Khan is a villain' (*paṛh Rūmikhān harāmkhōr paṛh Rūmīkhān harāmkhōr*), the Persian chronicler says that 'the King learned the meaning of this phrase through a translator' ('*Jannat Ashiānī* [Humayun] *chun ma 'āni ĩ 'ibārat rā az tarjumān mā 'alūm kardand*'). But the source of this story is the *Mirāt-ē-Sikandarī* written in 1308/1890 (Manjhu 1890: 247–248). While this may not be the language of Humayun's court, such words do exist in other sources from this period.

Akbar (r. 1556–1605) lived all his life in India and probably did use the language in private life. At least the use of a Hindi-Urdu obscenity in extreme rage would suggest this. This happened when Akbar was about to kill Adham Khan who had rebelled against him. In the words of Bayazid, in his book *Bahār-ē-Ajam*: '*Hazrat ba zubān Hindustānī farmūdand kē ayē kāndū*' (His Majesty in the language of Hindustani said 'O you catamite!') (Fazl Vol. 2, 1595: f.n. 3, p. 271). Some people (e.g. Chatterji and Masud Hasan Khan) have even attributed couplets in Braj to Akbar, but like Gian Chand Jain, one can only be sceptical about them (Jain in Jafer and Jain Vol. 1, 1998: 441–443).

The language was used in poetry as we have seen. It was also used in works of art which only very rich and powerful patrons could buy or commission. Evidence to this effect is provided by the existence of stories in verse with beautiful paintings. Such unpublished manuscripts of paintings with verses in Hindi-Urdu also exist in the British Museum. In one painting (Add. 16880), about the romance of Ratan Sen, Raja of Chitor with the Princess of Ceylon, there are verses 'composed in an archaic form of Deccani Urdu, with a large admixture of Arabic and Persian words' by a certain Hasan Manjhu Khilji, written about 1582

(Pinder-Wilson 1969: 143–145). Another such story with paintings and verse (BM. Or. 86) is a 'translation of the story [of Saif ul Muluk and Badi al-Jamal] into Deccani verse by Gawasi' in 1616–17 (Ibid., 177–178). In short, the elite probably knew enough Hindi-Urdu, at least in some parts of India such as the Deccan, to enjoy writings in it.

Indeed, if one looks at all the instances of the reported use of the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi it appears as if the language of the elite was the local language for those members of it who had spent a lot of time in India and who interacted much with the local people. Saints fell into that category as did Indian-born courtiers like Amir Khusrau. At the highest level, however, it was not necessary that people should know the language–barring a few words of it—because either they did not spend their whole lives in India or were isolated in Persian-speaking court circles. However, with the introduction of Rajput ladies in the harems of the Mughals, it is certain the later Mughals, from Akbar onwards, spoke the same language in private. In the Deccan and Gujarat, the elite seems to have known the language, even in pre-Mughal times. While the use of the sources of a later period, for a person who existed earlier, is obviously untrustworthy, the sources which are contemporaneous do suggest that the language was used spontaneously or with people who did not understand Persian. Sources from the seventeenth century use Urdu-Hindi words even where Persian equivalents exist, (*pān* rather than *barg-ē-tambōl* in Chishti 1623: 303) as if these were naturally accepted in the society just as English words are used both in Urdu and English writings in South Asia today. And, while doubting the exact words used by the speakers of an earlier age, these latter sources do help us understand that their writers thought that Hindi words attributed to revered personalities should be reported as such.

To sum up, the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi was considered so important that Bayazid Ansari uses it in Waziristan, a remote

part of present-day Pakistan. Kabir and Kabir *panthis* sang songs in it in present-day UP; saints kept using its words and whole sentences all the way from Gujarat to the Deccan, and there are even written works in it in remote parts of India.

So what is the implication of these facts for Urdu today? Taking the work of Shirani, who is probably the best researcher on the ancestry and origin of Urdu, this has certain ideological implications. For, if Urdu is traced back to an ancient time, it becomes endowed with more prestige than a mere newcomer, a mongrel language, would warrant. One is not claiming that this ancestry is wrong; it is certainly correct. But it does serve the political interest of the Muslim elite which could claim that it contributed to the refining and improvement of a language which may have existed in the land of their adoption when they arrived even in the eleventh century (see Jalibi 1975: 265)

However, if the language was present when the Muslims arrived, then the thesis that it is a Muslim language cannot be wholly true. This indeed is something which Muslims who lived before the partition in undivided India, or live in present-day India rather than Pakistan, keep claiming. It is, of course, true that the mixing of some Persian, quite a few Arabic and a few Turkish words changed the existing language to the extent that the pre-Muslim language—even if we were sure that we have discovered an authentic sample of it—is no longer intelligible, even then that original base cannot be dismissed or discounted. If English is a Germanic language because of its Anglo-Saxon (Germanic) base, despite the mixing of Latin and Greek through French and otherwise, then Urdu is also an Indic language despite the mixing of words from other languages. The denial of this original identity and the corresponding emphasis upon the mixing of words—as if this were true only of Urdu—reinforces the identification of Urdu with Muslims. Though the myth that Urdu was born in Mughal military camps is only to be found in school textbooks, the ancestry and Indic base of the language is not given the recognition it deserves by the historians of the

language. But, then, are questions of the historiography of Urdu politicized? To this we turn now.

NOTES

1. I thank Professor Vaishna Narang for having first transliterated these lines at the Jawaharlal Nehru University in May 2010 and sent them to me by e-mail. My transliteration is based upon her original specimen. I also thank Mr Anand Mishra from the South Asia Institute of the University of Heidelberg who translated these lines for me in English in June 2010 at Heidelberg. I also thank Dr Gautam Liu of the Institute of South Asian Studies, University of Heidelberg, for having transcribed the following lines in the Devanagari script from *Gorakh Bani.*

   बसती न सुन्यं सुन्यं न बसती अगम अगोचर ऐसा।
   गगन-सिषर महि बालक बोलै ताका नांव धरहुगे कैसा॥१॥
   अदेषि देषिबा देषि बिचारिबा अदिसिटि राषिबा चीथा।
   पाताल की गंगा ब्रह्मांड चढाइबा तहां बिमल बिमल जल पीया॥२॥
   इहां ही आछै इहां ही अलोप इहां ही रचिलै तीनि त्रिलोक।
   आछै संगै रहै ज वा ता कारणि अनंत सिधा जोगेस्वर हूवा॥३॥
   वेद कतेब न षाणीं बाणीं। सब ढंकी तलि आंणीं॥
   गगनि सिषर महि सबद प्रकास्या। तहं बूझै अलष बिनांणीं॥४॥

2. The text given in transliteration is reproduced in the Devanagari script below:

   ओ जनाना में थारा वंसरा टाल ओ दुजो जावेगा नहीं ओर थारी बैठक
   दली में ही जी प्रमाणे परधान बरोबर कारण देवेगा

3. महारज सलामत, यामै जु खातिर मुबारिक में पसंद अबे सु अरजदासत करैला, फारसी अरजदासत सीताबी के सवब नही करी ह| जु नवाब सलामत खां जी नै फरमाया जु नै फरमाया जु जलद जोड़ी चले जु| जलद समाचारों की अरजदासत करी है (राजपुताना 1692)

4. *Mirā'at-e-Ahmadī* has been published in two different editions. The one used here is a text in Persian with three volumes in one cover but each volume is numbered separately. The names of two people whose 'endeavour and administration' (*ba sai ō ēhtēmām*) given on the first page are Qazi Abdul Kareem and Qazi Rahmatullah and the date of publication is 1306/1888–89. The author is originally Ali Mohammad Khan. This is referred to in the bibliography as Khan (1889). The other one is a work in two volumes by Ali Mohammad Khan whose nom de plume, Mirza Mohammad Hasan, is also mentioned on the first page. This is mentioned in the bibliography as Khan (1928). Quotations from the saints of Gujarat in the text are from the 1889 publication.

5. دوهرہ: فرید اد ہر سولی سر پنجرہ تلیاں تہوکن کاگ

رب رجیوں با ہوری تو دہن ہمارے بہاگ

6. جت گھر زمین نہ پای مبیا مبندھی تت

چتو پردیسی پاہنا ھی او ٹھائی جت

The meaning of *mabiā mabandhī* could not be found in any dictionary consulted by the author.

7. کنتَ نہوہیّن کاُریری تاکان ہتَ مَناَئی

بس کندلے مدہن گرہورِیں لُہد کہا

Some of the words of this couplet are given in the glossary. However, the meaning of the whole is not clear to this author.

8. یَینَا ہن بَھاِجی اَیسا شکھ سَین باُسُون

Most of the individual words of this hemistich are given in the glossary. The last four words mean 'found so much profound peace and tranquillity'. However, the meaning of the whole is not clear to this author.

4

Origins and Historiography

The theories about the origins of Urdu revolve around two questions: where was it born? And what language(s) did it descend from? The first question is geographical; the second genealogical. And both are addressed in the historiography of the language—ideologically, politically, and sometimes, emotionally and polemically. This chapter does not attempt to provide the correct answers to these questions. Rather, it aims to study the major theories about them so as to determine in what ways historiography is related to ideology—especially those aspects of it which contribute to the politics of identity among the speakers of Urdu and Hindi in South Asia. Some of these questions are treated in a book entitled *Literature and Nationalist Ideology*, which provides, among other things, a framework for examining the relationship between Indian nationalism(s) and literary and linguistic histories (Harder 2010).

As questions of place of birth and parentage lead to perceptions of belonging or ownership, we shall take into account the historiography of possession. Specifically, is Urdu a joint product of the interaction between Muslims and Hindus and is, therefore, a shared possession? Or is it the possession and monopoly of the Muslims of a certain area of the subcontinent? Or all Muslims? The answers to these questions are, of course, deeply political in significance. That is why the purely linguistic answers to questions of origin are insufficient for our purposes. More relevant are the ideological forces and inspiration behind these answers.

To begin, then, the theories themselves are easy to summarize—as they have already been by Ayub Sabir (1993) to a degree—but our purposes require us to analyze them in terms of the ideological orientation, or if that is difficult to determine, the group-identity of the linguistic historians who are most prominently associated with them.

The most obvious classifications about the geographical and the genealogical questions are (a) the theories of Indian origin and (b) the theories of Pakistani origin.

The most common theories, and ones which contemporary scholars agree with, is that 'the speech of the areas around Delhi, known as *Khari Boli* [*Kárī bolī*], was adopted by the Afghans, Persians, and Turks as a common language of interaction with the local population. In time, it developed a variety called Urdu' (Kachru 2008: 82). There are variant forms of it, such as Muhammad Hussain Azad's (d. 1910) assertion in *Āb-ē-Hayāt* (*c.* 19th century) that 'everybody knows this much that our language Urdu is born out of Braj Bhasha and that Braj Bhasha is a purely Indian language' (Azad *c.* 19th century: 10). But, on the whole, Western Hindi is the most likely candidate for the parent of both modern Urdu and Hindi.

In this context the views of Suniti Kumar Chatterji are instructive. In his book on the development of Bengali he succinctly says: 'Hindōstāni is in its origin based on the Western Hindi dialects spoken in and around Delhi, dialects which were strongly influenced by the contiguous Panjābī and Rājisthānī; and as the speech of the capital, it gradually came to be adopted by the Turki, Persian and Pastō speaking nobility of the Moslem court' (Chatterji 1926: 11–12). In his other book *Indo-Aryan and Hindi*, he explains this history in detail in several chapters (Chatterji 1942: 150–188). Among other things he conjectures that groups of Punjabi Muslims moved from their homeland in the West from 1206 onwards (the date of the establishment of the Turkish Sultanate in Delhi) to Delhi, and their language

influenced the language already prevalent here (Chatterji 1942: 187–188). George Grierson, of the *Linguistic Survey of India* fame, gave the following answers to both questions about the origins of Urdu-Hindi:

> The dialect of Western Hindī spoken in Western Rohilkhand, in the Upper Gangetic Doab, and in the Panjab district of Ambala is what I call Vernacular Hindōstānī, that is to say, it is the form of speech on which literary Hindōstānī that took its rise in Delhi is based (Grierson Vol. 3: 63).

Examples can be multiplied but it is pointless to make a list of authors agreeing with each other.

What is more interesting is that historians of Urdu emphasize the role of the Muslim heritage languages almost to the exclusion of the Indian element. Let us now turn to the views of two of these scholars of Urdu: Jamil Jalibi and Hafiz Mahmud Shirani, on the subject of the historiography of the language.

Jamil Jalibi believes that Urdu has a distinctive Muslim character. He does not deny the Indic base of Urdu but he calls the Islamization of literary themes and the Persianization of the language as improvements (see Chapter 5). In *Tārīkh-ē- Adab-ē-Urdū* (1975) Jamil Jalibi says:

> *Ibtidā mẽ is nē-Gujrāt mẽ bhī aōr shimāl ō Dakan mẽ bhī-Khālis Hindavī asrāt kō qubūl kiā-lēkin jab āgē baṛhnē kā rāstā nazar na ā rahā hō aōr takhlīqī zahen apnē izhār mẽ rukāwat maēhsūs kar rahā hō tō zāhir haē kē vō us taraf baṛhē gā jis taraf usē rāstā nazar ā rahā hō* (Jalibi: Vol. 1, 1975: 193).
>
> (In the beginning both in Gujarat and the Deccan it [Urdu] accepted pure Hindvi effects but when the way for advancement is not visible and the creative mind finds impediments in its expression, then it is obvious it would advance towards that side on which it sees the way).

He says this Persianization of Urdu was a natural act (*fitrī amal*) and that any other course of action was impossible. In his view the poetry of the poets of Bijapur is alien for us in contrast to those of Golconda because of the Persianization of the latter. Thus the poetry of Nusrati is not known and that of Vali is. As proof, he offers the words of a poet called Shafiq, who wrote his *Chamanistān-ē-Shu'arā* in 1761 in which he said about Nusrati '*alfāzish batāur Dakhniã bar Zubānahā girã mī āed*' (His words are felt to be heavy on the tongue like those of the Deccanites).

Let us now take up the views of Shirani who has been mentioned earlier. Shirani tells us that up to the seventeenth century, Hindi rhythm was used. However, after Quli Qutab Shah (988/1580–1020/1611–12) there is evidence of Persian influence. At one place he says:

> *fi zamānanā is taehrīk kī mukhālfat mẽ bāz halqõ sē āvāz buland huī haē aōr is kō ghaēr mulkī aōr nā'āqbat andēshānā kahā gayā haē-lēkin hamārā khiāl haē kē buzurgõ kī yē jiddat pasandī jahã tak kē is kē natāej dēkhē jātē haē-nehāet mufīd aōr sūdmand sābit huī haē* (Shirani 1930 and 31 in 1965: 200).
>
> (In these days there is opposition from some circles to this trend [Persianization]. It is attacked as being foreign and short sighted. But we think that our elders in their search for novelty were right as the results we see are greatly useful and profitable).

Moreover, Shirani presents the thesis that Urdu should have 'Muslim emotions'. He feels that the language called Urdu is distinctive and separate from other languages because it has (a) *Musalmānī Jazbāt ō Khiālāt*, i.e. the emotions and ideas of Muslims (b) *Arabī ō Fārsī alfāz*, i.e. diction from Arabic and Persian, and (c) its grammatical rules follow a certain order (Shirani 1930 and 31 in 1965: 174).

The last point however, has not been explained. Moreover, Shirani has left out one point—that the script should be Perso-

Arabic. All the examples he provides in his book are in this script.

The same is also true about Jamil Jalibi mentioned earlier, though he is one of the few historians who has mentioned Nam Dev (1270–1350), Kabir (1399–1518) and Guru Nanak (1469–1538) in nine pages (out of 711). Abdul Jamil Khan has mentioned all these as well as Hem Chandra (*c.* 12th century), Chand Bardai (*c.* 1190s) and a few others in two pages (2006: 159–164). Abdul Haq (1870–1961), called Baba-i-Urdu (the Father of Urdu), does not even mention anything written by a Hindu in the Devanagari script in a book entitled *Qadim Urdū* [Old Urdu] (1961). Muhammad Sadiq's *A History of Urdū Literature* (1964), does not mention anyone but Muslims and writings in the Perso-Arabic script, and Ali Jawad Zaidi, though writing in post-partition India, mentions Kabir in less than a page (Zaidi 1993: 31–32). Even Hindu historians, when writing the history of Urdu, ignore writings in the Devanagari script. For instance, in the paradigmatic work of Ram Babu Saksena, *A History of Urdū Literature* (1927), Kabir and Tulsi Das (1550–1624) get only passing mention in one line (Saksena 1927: 11). In short, while historians of Urdu admit to the Indic base of Urdu, they do not include it in the canon of Urdu. And this is not simply because of lack of space. Shamsur Rahman Faruqi, one of the foremost contemporary scholars of Urdu, in his book on the initial age of Urdu (*Urdū kā Ibtidāi Zamānā*), points out that the language which later came to be known as 'Khari Boli' existed at the time of Muslim arrival in India, and the Muslims acted as 'chemical agents' in order to make it an established language (Faruqi 1999: 36). But he gives no attention to the literature in the Devanagari script before the creation of modern Persianized Urdu and Sanskritized Hindi in the nineteenth century. And this, despite the fact that he points out that Azad's *Āb-ē-Hayāt* ignores the contribution of Hindus to Urdu literature (Faruqi 1999: 43–44). Yet, it is not merely a question of the inclusion of poets writing in the Perso-Arabic

script, which Azad ignores. The point being made here is the ideology which goes into the construction of the history of Urdu. Azad had to imagine a mother for Urdu which is 'simple, sweet, natural, and entirely Indian' (Pritchett and Faruqi 2001: 12). The British were defining the cultural world of their Indian colony and simplicity and naturalness were at a premium. These were to be found in English and Braj Bhasha which formed the 'storage trunks' of Urdu. According to Pritchett and Faruqi Azad's views show 'the widespread defensive reaction of the colonized to the colonial critique' (Ibid., 17). In short, Azad's literary and linguistic ideologies had to perform a balancing act: finding Indian ancestry for Urdu but also Muslim ownership; finding British literary criteria but also preserving indigenous ideals.

But there is an ideology at work in the construction of the history of Hindi also. For instance, the historians of Hindi ignore the contribution of Muslims to a common literature. Acharya Ramchandra Shukla's *Hindī Sahityā kā Itihās* (1929), even ignores the canonical poets of Urdu. Hans Harder, writing on the ideological uses of literary historiography, comments on this as follows:

> In a way, the long-standing issue of the relationship between Hindi and Urdu also belongs to this complex, leading to the linguistically unwarranted, but politically successful and by now almost un-questioned decision on Ramchandra Shukla's and apparently some of his predecessor's part, to include rather 'deviant' varieties, in relation to modern standard Khari Boli Hindi, such as Braj and Avadhi, in the history of Hindi literature, but to mostly exclude the linguistically closer, if not identical, Urdu from the repertoire (Harder 2010: 18).

Since Shukla's book was used as a textbook in colleges, it had tremendous influence over the perception of students of several generations. That is why, describing it as a paradigmatic text in five pages, Krishna Kumar claims that it 'contributed to the

crystallization of the educated Hindi speaker's identity' (Kumar 1991: 131). Also like the historians of Urdu, they too seek Hindi's birthplace. And, of course, it is in 'Hindustan'. Rahul Sankrityayan mentions 'all the languages which emerged after the eighth century AD in "Suba Hindustan"' (Quoted from Rai 2001: 12). Others point to the fluidity of the unstandardized languages of the period such as the kind the Nath Panthi Sadhus used to speak during the tenth and eleventh centuries. This language was called *pachmēlā*—five-in-one—which we now call Braj Bhasha, Khari Boli, Avadhi, Bhojpuri and Bundeli (Jindal 1955: 9)—and, indeed, it went beyond these five to include Punjabi and Rajasthani dialects.

But the mention of Gorakh Nath Panthis brings us to another ideological imperative—but a completely necessary one—which inspired the historians of Hindi. This was the search for an indigenous parent going back to pre-Islamic times. As mentioned earlier, this was found by Pitambar Datta Barthwal who found the *Gorakh Bānī*. Another milestone of this kind is Hazari Prasad Dwivedi's *Nāth Siddhõ kī Bāniã* (1957). This literature is the centerpiece of works like Amrit Rai's *A House Divided* (1984) and Gian Chand Jain's *Ēk Bhasha: Dō Likhāvat, Dō Adab* (2005), which are considered an attack on the tradition of Urdu historiography. The quest for a link with the pre-Islamic tradition, initiated by Rahul Sankrityayan, had already taken Hindi back to pre-Islamic times when he, in collaboration with Jayaswal, discovered Siddha literature (Jindal 1955: 5–6). The Siddhas are said to have 'mixed the standard forms of Western apabhranshas with the current forms of the adjacent western districts' (Jindal 1955: 5). The samples of Siddha poetry transliterated into Hindi by Rahul Sankrityayan have words which are not fully intelligible but yield meaning with some effort. For instance the first line of Sarhapa (Nālanda): '*gurū ban amyā ras*' in the Siddha language is transliterated in Hindi as '*gurū kē vachan amiyā ras*' (the words of the teacher are like the sweet nectar of mangoes).

Most academic histories, however, caution us against accepting the Panthi language as being authentically of the tenth or even the twelfth centuries as claimed. McGregor, for instance, asserts that it 'can hardly predate the mid–14th century in its present linguistic form' (McGregor 1984: 22). Shardadvi Vedalankar claims that there are no manuscripts of Hindi prose 'produced between the 10th and 12th centuries AD' (she does not include deeds of gifts and inscriptions among prose writings) (Vendalankar 1969: 3) but some, like Vijendra Snātak, admit that, while some are doubtful, others are authentic (Snatak 1999: 30).

With this genealogy established in ideologically motivated writings, the historiography of Hindi appropriated the vast literature in all the varieties, which together add up to Greater Hindi. However, when Khari Boli came to be accepted as *the* language which was the base for Hindi, the other varieties—including the poetic Braj Bhasha—were excluded from the Hindi canon. Ayodhya Prasad Khattri in his *Kharī Bōlī ka Padyā*, in his desire to monopolize Khari Boli as the desiderated parent for Hindi, agreed that 'Urdu is but another form of Hindi' (Quoted from Rai 2001: 86). Chandradhar Sharma Guleri, the author of *Purānī Hindi*, also says that Urdu is the same as Hindi and that Modern Hindi was created by replacing Perso-Arabic diction with Sanskritic words (Quoted from Rai 2001: 14).

But this relationship with Urdu promoted the urge to invent difference, not to acknowledge or promote closeness. Thus, diction was Sanskritized, the preferred idiom diverged from that of Modern Urdu (i.e. the Urdu constructed in the late eighteenth century) and the pronunciation of some sounds and words was different from native Urdu-speakers. As for literature in the Perso-Arabic script, it was either accepted as being 'Hindi'—as in the case of Amir Khusrau's work—if it was of sufficient antiquity and symbolic value or played down, marginalized and ignored.

In short, questions of the origin of Urdu, which are also questions of the origin of Hindi, bring us close and then take us apart as the same geographical location and genealogy are, nevertheless, wrenched apart by the uses to which the historiography of both languages lends itself to. But now let us see what happens when the geography and the genealogy are different. When, for example, they are located in present-day Pakistan.

The theories of Pakistani origin claim that Urdu was born in the areas now in Pakistan as a result of Perso-Arabicization of the languages spoken here. The pioneer of such theories was Hafiz Mahmud Shirani, some of whose works and views have been mentioned before. Normally a painstaking and careful researcher of Urdu and Persian, Shirani turned his attention from Persian to Urdu when Abdullah Yusuf Ali (1872–1953), then principal of Islamia College, asked him to write something on the origins and age of Urdu. As Shirani was a lecturer in this college between 1921 and 1928, his initial endeavours came to light during these years. Almost the whole corpus of his writings on linguistic history—for that is how his work would be classified now—addresses these questions directly or indirectly. Of course, while working on these issues he encounters other areas of interest out of which many of his literary and other works are born, but basically these are the mainsprings of his enormous output.

Shirani's magnum opus is *Punjāb Mẽ Urdū* (1928). The central thesis of this work is that Urdu was created in the Punjab and the Muslims took it with them to Delhi when they spread from the western part of India eastwards. A variant of this thesis is that it was the Multani variety of Punjabi (Siraiki as it is called now) which was the basis of Urdu (Mughal 1990: 11–20). A corollary of this hypothesis is that Punjabi/Siraiki and Urdu are very similar even now—Shirani claims that the two languages share a large part of the basic vocabulary (Shirani 1928: 130–131). And that words used in old Urdu (Shirani's term) are still used

in Punjabi. However, there are certain distinctive features (morphological [*kā, kī*] and others) which separate Urdu from Braj Bhasha as well as Punjabi/Siraiki (which he calls Multani).

Among other things, Shirani points to the presence of words still used in Punjabi in old Urdu (especially Dakhni) as well as such words in modern Urdu. In the latter case they have no separate meaning but are used as idiomatic usages to supplement and strengthen the meaning. Examples are as follows:

Din dehāṛē	The word '*din*' means day in Urdu. '*Dehāṛē*' means day in Punjabi even now. In Urdu the latter word is not used in isolation but is used in this idiomatic phrase.
Māngā Tāngā	'*Māngā*' is to take as a loan; to beg in Urdu. '*Tāngā*' means the same in Punjabi but has no meaning on its own in modern Urdu (Shirani 1928: 126–129).

Similarly the possessive marker '*kā*,' '*kī*' in Urdu is '*dā*' and '*dī*' in Punjabi nowadays but there are a number of places in the Punjab with endings on '*kē*' and '*kā*' such as Muridkē, Sadhukē, etc.

From this evidence Shirani concludes that Urdu is a 'developed'—his term—form of Punjabi. An alternative hypothesis, which Shirani does not even consider, is that Urdu, Hindi, Punjabi, Siraiki, Hindko, etc., could simply be descendants of a language spread over the huge area from Peshawar to Benares. That the varieties of such a language would have some vocabulary in common but would also grow and change along different lines is only natural. But Shirani's book is not really a thesis from beginning to end because he also makes it a history of the writers of varieties of what he calls 'Old Urdu'. This has only an indirect relationship with the main theme but takes most of the space in the book (Shirani 1928: 180–486).

On the whole, Shirani, whose research on the ancient names, origin and usage of Urdu is so impressive, is on a weak footing in this book. His mistakes and false reasoning have been

demonstrated notably by Masood Husain Khan who argues that Shirani ignores the differences between Dakhni and Punjabi as well as other evidence which suggest that Urdu has descended from Khari Boli rather than Punjabi (Khan 1966: 156–180). Shaukat Sabzwari uses similar arguments to refute Shirani's claims (Sabzwari n.d.: 66–112) and to assert that the apabhranshas of the Delhi and Meerut Doab region (Madhiya Desh) of the eleventh century is the ancestor of Urdu (Ibid., 101).

Why were the weaknesses of his reasoning not evident to Shirani himself? After all, he was normally a careful researcher. The reason can only be conjectured. In my view, Shirani was not only a pioneer of certain trends in Urdu's linguistic history, but also a pioneer of Muslim nationalism in South Asia. He lived at the time of the rise of Muslim nationalism which, as we know, was expressed through the symbols of Islam and Urdu. He witnessed the Urdu-Hindi controversy and was as much concerned with claiming Urdu as part of the Muslim heritage in India as Abdul Haq or other Muslim nationalists. This ideological imperative closed his mind to other hypotheses about the birth of Urdu. His emotional and ideological interests were best served if he associated Urdu with the Muslims and that too of the Punjab, a major Muslim-majority province of India and one where he had spent almost all his adult life. It is because of this that modern Pakistani nationalists have appropriated Shirani's work—witness Fateh Mohammad Malik's foreword to its publication, which refers to a pre-partition controversy about making Punjabi rather than Urdu the medium of instruction in the Punjab, and is entitled 'Urdu is the mother-tongue of the Punjab' (Malik 2006 in Malik et al., Vol. 4: 1–5).

A theory similar to that of Shirani was also advanced by Grahame Bailey, a British man of letters, in a book completed in 1929 but published in 1932. He too claimed that Urdu began in Lahore after the Ghaznavide conquest in 1027. Like Shirani he too conjectured that it moved to Delhi about 166 years later

where it was 'overlaid by old Khari' which was 'not very different from old Punjabi'. It also kept absorbing words from Persian and Arabic and so Urdu was born (Bailey 1932: 7).

In 1933 another theory claiming the birth of Urdu in the areas where the Muslims arrived first was propounded. The man who advocated it was Syed Sulaiman Nadvi (1884–1953) whose stature as a scholar and a leader of the Muslims of North India is well-known. Nadvi argued that the first place of the arrival of the Muslims was Sindh and, therefore, it was this place which could be the birthplace of Urdu. The ancestor in this case would be Sindhi (Nadvi 1939: 31–35).

Unfortunately, Nadvi did not explain why Sindhi remained so distinct from Urdu. And also how was it that Urdu actually assimilated more Persian than Arabic words. And, indeed, the Arabic words which did enter Urdu came via Persian. Even more to the point is the fact that the Arabs came into contact with Dravidian languages in the Malabar. Though this did bring Arabic words into these languages, it did not create anything like Urdu. The Sindhi hypothesis is much weaker than that of Punjabi, on the grounds that there is no similarity between the fragments of old Sindhi and those of Hindi-Urdu now available to us. There are, however, similarities between some forms of Hindi-Urdu— such as Dakhni—and Punjabi. However, there are many more similarities with the varieties of Hindi found in India. In any case, if Punjabi is also accepted as a variety of Greater Hindi—a hypothetical language spread out from the plains of Peshawar to the end of Bihar—the similarities can be explained.

Other theories claim Hindko, Gujri and Pahari—all mutually intelligible varieties of what may be called 'Greater Punjabi'—as the ancestor of Urdu. All the arguments advanced in order to put forward the candidature of Punjabi as the ancestor of Urdu, apply with equal force here. But the point is not whether some words—such as *rājā* (ruler), *putrā* (son), *ātma* (soul), *likhia* (wrote)—found in a kharoshthi tablet in the Hindko-speaking

area, make Hindko the ancestor of Hindi-Urdu as Ghaznavi (2003: 130–131) argues. Such words are found in Nath Panthi literature also. The point is to analyse why such finds, which can be used to support the candidature of many languages in many parts of the subcontinent, are used to support any one particular language.

Theory of Non-Sanskritic Origin

While all the theories we have considered so far trace Urdu back to Sanskritic roots (the Indic branch of the Indo-Aryan language family) there are a few attempts at discarding this genealogy altogether. There is, for instance, Ain ul Haq Faridkoti who traces Urdu back to the Munda and Dravidian languages spoken in the subcontinent before the Aryan incursions. More precisely, it is a descendant of the ancient language of the Indus valley and its immediate ancestor is Punjabi. Later in the book the author uses the adjective 'Pakistani' for colonies from the Indus valley in Central Asia till present-day Pakistan (Faridkoti 1972: 264–266). In short, the author disconnects Urdu from both the Gangetic valley and the Sanskrit language and appropriates it for the areas now called Pakistan.

Another book with somewhat similar arguments from archaeology and linguistics is Rashid Akhtar Nadvi's (1913–1992) book entitled *Pakistān Kā Qadīm Rasmul Khat aōr Zubān* (1995). The main argument is that the Aryans started using the language of Mohenjo Daro and even Sanskrit was born out of this mixture. This Sindhi ancestor of Urdu, he says, was the real queen who ruled from Peshawar to Bihar and not Sanskrit, which lived a life of concealment like a mistress in the cells of Pandits (Nadvi 1995: 303). In this way, like Faridkoti, Nadvi too appropriates Urdu for Pakistan

Yet another book on these lines is Abdul Jamil Khan's *The Politics of Language Urdū/Hindi: An Artificial Divide* (2006). Here too the main argument is that 'two foreign languages Munda and

Dravidian' laid the foundations of Urdu (Khan 2006: 108). However, the author does not reserve Urdu for Pakistan. Despite his search for Urdu's 'African heritage' and 'Mesopotamian roots' he argues that not only Urdu but all Indian languages descend from these common roots. Moreover, his major focus is that Hindi and Urdu are the same language. However, part of his argument is that the further 'evolution of old Urdu involves infusion of Arabic and Persian from the oldest source, Mesopotamia' (Khan 2006: 132). In other words, he provides a continuous line of influence from Iraq—a Muslim country—on Urdu, rather than in India. Of course the Arabic, Persian and Turkish element in Urdu are acknowledged by all scholars, but taking it back to the very root of the language while discounting the centrality of an Indic base language and Sanskrit, dilutes the Indian identity of the language. He does the same for the scripts arguing that the Nagari-Hindi script, like the Perso-Arabic one, is 'rooted in the West Asian and Phoenician-Armaic system' (Ibid., 361).

Narratives of Ownership

Whatever the scholarly status of these theories, what is more significant is the use to which they are put as far as our analysis of historiography is concerned. We have seen that there are two narratives about the ownership of Urdu. First, that it is the common language of the Hindus and Muslims of North India; the fruit of centuries of coexistence which was mostly peaceful, and hence, a cultural product of the Jumna-Gangetic civilization (Ganga-Jamna *Taēhzīb*). And second, that it is a Muslim language, a Muslim cultural preserve and, therefore, just as alien to the Hindus as Hindi is to the Muslims.

For the British, there was always a Muslim Hindustani and a Hindu one. They did not sometimes mention the kaesth class of Hindus or a number of other urban people who used and owned Urdu. As Christopher King argues, it took a long time for the

equation Urdu=Muslim+Hindu to change to Urdu=Muslim and Hindi=Hindu. Indeed, even 'throughout the history of the Hindi movement before independence the equation Hindi=Hindu was never true' because rural people kept using regional standards (such as *kaithi*) and some Hindus remained 'wedded to Urdu' (King 1994: 177).

Each one of the major theories outlined above has political implications: the Indian origin theory gives the ownership of Urdu to India; the Pakistani origin ones to Pakistan; and the theories dismissing Sanskrit as the mother of most Indian languages or locating the ancestor of Urdu in present-day Pakistan detach Urdu from India. They also substitute a non-Indian ancestry for Urdu in place of an Indian one. But more importantly, these narratives of ownership are politically significant when they come from Muslim intellectuals and leaders. In this context let us first take the works of Abdul Haq who wrote grammars, dictionaries and other works on Urdu.

In all these works Haq's style is historical rather than linguistic. Basically his focal point is vocabulary. It is with reference to this, rather than phonology or syntax, that he supports his major theses which are that (1) Urdu is an ancient language which developed in Gujarat and Deccan, earlier than it did in North India where it was born (Haq 1961); and (2) Persian influenced the languages of North India, mainly the ancestor of Urdu but also other languages such as Marathi (Haq 1933), and is, therefore, now a natural part of the linguistic heritage of North India.

These theses had political implications during the period leading up to the partition of India. These were, after all, the Urdu-Hindi controversy days and Abdul Haq wished to promote the idea that Urdu was the common heritage language of the Muslim and Hindu civilizations of India. Therefore, he argued, that Urdu—which could be called Hindustani—should be promoted in all the domains of power in India. The other

candidate for this role was modern or Sanskritized Hindi which Abdul Haq opposed as an artificially constructed and partly incomprehensible language (AIR 1939: 31).

After partition Abdul Haq migrated to Pakistan where he reversed his earlier position of calling Urdu the joint heritage of Hindus and Muslims. Now he emphasized the Muslim ownership of Urdu. Indeed, he said:

> *Urdū zubān hī Pākistān kī binā kā bā ʿas huī- yē zubān hamārī zindagī kā juz aōr tāēhzīb ō qaōmiat kī buniyād haē*
> (The Urdu language is the basis for the creation of Pakistan. This language is the element of our life and the basis of our civilization and nationality) (Haq n.d. b: 20).

He also said that it was Urdu which had disseminated the propaganda of the Muslim League so that it had reached 'in every street and every house' (Haq n.d. b: Bē).

Syed Sulaiman Nadvi was another intellectual who took the same position as Abdul Haq before the partition. He began by arguing that Urdu is not the language of any particular nation (*qaōm*) and that it had 'no special association with the Muslims' (*Musalmānõ kē sāth kōi khās khusūsiat nahî*) (Nadvi 1939: 6), and then he comes to his most important recommendation—that the name 'Urdu', which was only one hundred and fifty years old, should be abandoned in favour of Hindustani (Nadvi 1939: 74). But, while giving such conciliatory suggestions, Nadvi also says that wherever there are Muslims in the whole 'length and breadth of India', they speak and understand Urdu, no matter what their mother-tongue may be (Ibid., 67).

In 1950, however, Nadvi came to live in Pakistan, though probably for private reasons, where he took an active role in Islamizing the constitution and supporting Pakistani nationalism of which Urdu was an important symbolic component. Indeed, he opposed the major challenge to Urdu from Bengali when he declared during the Third Historical Conference in February 1953

in Dhaka, that Bengali was saturated with Hindu influences and needed to be Islamized (Abdullah 1976: 35; Nadvi, M. 1986: 582). This was a far cry from his acceptance of the Hindu linguistic heritage of Urdu-Hindi for which he was famous in his pre-partition days (Siddiqui 1986: 131–169).

It is this strategic use of competing narratives about the ownership of Urdu which Gian Chand Jain finds so infuriating (Jain 2005: 265–269). But it could also be interpreted as the adoption of an extremist position after efforts at conciliation and accommodation fail. This is exactly what happened in the political field, after all, as Ayesha Jalal (1985), Ajeet Jawed (1998) and Jaswant Singh (2009) have brought out.

After partition, political imperatives continue to influence the scholars' choice of narratives of ownership. In Pakistan, Urdu is celebrated as a language of Muslims and its ownership is not shared with the Hindus. From children's textbooks to scholarly works it is called the national language of Pakistan—though this is contested by ethnic nationalists (Rahman 1996)—and the most important part of Pakistan's Islamic heritage. However, here Urdu is in service of the ideology of nationalism as, indeed, is Islam itself.

One example of this use of linguistic history is the recent publication of the National Language Authority Islamabad in five volumes—each dedicated to a region of Pakistan—which celebrates Urdu as a Pakistani language. The pattern followed in each book is to give pride of place to articles arguing that Urdu was born in that region (Sindh, Punjab, NWFP, Balochistan) followed by writings on its use, especially by creative writers, in it (Malik et al. 2006: Vols. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5). In the volume on Kashmir (Vol. 5), however, the emphasis is on the use of Urdu in the former princely state which still remains disputed between Pakistan and India. Here too the 'Gujri' language of the Gujar tribe, some of whom live in parts of the former state, is celebrated

as the mother of Urdu, and 'Pahari', another language of this area, is compared with Urdu (Karnahi 2007).

This nationalistic claim over Urdu is nothing new. Jamil Jalibi, who has been referred to earlier, dedicates a chapter to Urdu in the areas of Pakistan in his two-volume *Tārīkh-ē-Adab-ē-Urdū* (1975: 593–712). And another author, who, at the time of writing was a colonel in the Pakistan Army, clearly states that the theories that Urdu was born in the regions now in Pakistan is a source of joy because these are the areas which are witnessing its youth. Moreover, he also expresses gratification that Urdu was born in military cantonments and that his purpose— spreading the use of Urdu in the army—is thereby facilitated (Khan 1989: 11–12). In India the question of identity politics is even more vexing for Muslims than it is in Pakistan. The major narrative of Indian Muslims is that Urdu is a symbol of the composite culture of the Hindus and Muslims of North India. Indeed, Muslim leaders are at pains to prove that Urdu is an Indian language (both geographically and genealogically), and that it is a shared cultural product of all North Indians. Salman Khurshid, an important Muslim politician, wrote in the preface of a book on the politics of Urdu in India:

> Urdu has always been projected as the language of the Muslim invaders, and later on was deemed responsible for the partition of India and the formation of Pakistan. In other words, it lost its primacy relevance as a language of common Indian civic space (Farouqui 2006: ix).

The question of ownership is a key issue in India. If it is only a Muslim preserve, then it is a minority language. This, exactly, is what has been happening and the Gujral Committee Report (1975) assumes that this is so. But if it is the common language of North India and major Indian cities—as its spoken form arguably is—then it has the same legal standing as Hindi written

in the Devanagari script (for an explanation of this position see Pemberton 2006: 142–144).

In short the narratives of ownership of Urdu are constrained by the political realities of one's country of residence, the religious community one happens to be born into and such other non-linguistic factors.

To sum up, the historiography of Urdu has been under the domination of identity politics and other aspects of ideology. The debate about the origins of Urdu is influenced by identity politics because the geographical location and genealogy of the language facilitate its appropriation as a cultural product by Indians and Pakistanis, Muslims and Hindus and, indeed, by both under certain circumstances. Pakistani nationalists have appropriated the debate about Urdu's roots to the nationalist enterprise. Claims about Punjabi, Sindhi, Hindko, and Siraiki being the ancestors of Urdu are also flattering for the speakers of these languages because Urdu is the national language and the symbol of Muslim identity in South Asia. Thus, besides feeding into the imperatives of nationalism, the debate also feeds into ethnic and linguistic pride. Indian, and specifically identity-conscious Hindus, have also moved from locating Hindi in India and tracing its ancestry to an Indian language to owning it after moving it as far from Urdu as possible. Thus, the debates on Urdu, as well as Hindi, have shifted from linguistic identity to nationalistic identity. But is modern Urdu the ancestor of the language which was called Hindi for most of its history? Or is it a recently constructed product like Sanskritized Hindi? What is its identity and how has it been created? These are questions which we will try to answer in the next chapter.

5

Identity: The Islamization of Urdu

The Islamization of Urdu is my term for the use of excessive Persian and Arabic words as well as the overall references to Indian Islamic culture in the ancestor of modern Urdu and Hindi between the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries. Sometime later—from the early nineteenth century onwards—Hindi was Hinduized also. Both languages were given communal identities during the colonial period. The standardization of Modern Urdu and Hindi is the process by which they were given these polarized identities. This chapter will look at this process only for Urdu but not for Hindi, which is outside the purview of this book. However, it should be mentioned at the outset that in both languages this was done by indexing linguistic symbols—scripts, allusions, idiom, rhetorical devices, and formulaic expressions— with a civilizational or cultural identity. Such devices associated this single language with different religious and ethnic identities in the minds of their own users as well as others.

This is not to say that languages are never associated with identities. Classical Arabic, though used by Arab Muslims as well as Christians for formal functions, is mostly associated with Islam. Hebrew is associated with the Israeli as well as the Jewish identity (Spolsky and Shohamy 1999: 65–73). Latin is associated with the Roman Catholic Church (Ostler 2007: 313) and Sanskrit, though its 'cosmopolitanism never carried particularistic religious notions' in the past (Pollock 2006: 572), became a marker of the Hindu nationalist identity during the colonial period when identity took shape.

The Muslim elites ruling India since the thirteenth century used Persian as the court language. However, when the British rulers of India replaced Persian with the vernacular languages of India—of which Urdu, albeit called Hindustani by the British, was one—in 1834, the Muslim elite had already adopted a deliberately Persianized form of the language which functioned as an identity symbol for this elite (Rai 1984: 248–250). The nineteenth and early twentieth centuries saw Urdu getting more closely associated with Islam as religious literature proliferated and the Pakistan Movement made it a symbol of Muslim identity. In the same way Hindi was separated from Urdu and identified 'as the language of the Hindus' during the same period (Dalmia 1997: 147–148).

The separation of Urdu from Hindi, which has been described by Amrit Rai (1984: 226–284) is contingent upon the script (Devanagari for Hindi; Perso-Arabic for Urdu); lexicon (borrowings from Sanskrit for Hindi; Arabic and Persian for Urdu); and cultural references (Hindu history and beliefs for Hindi; Islamic history and ideology for Urdu). These language-planning processes led to the splitting of a language (Hindi-Urdu) into modern Persianized and Arabicized Urdu at one extreme and modern Sanskritized Hindi at the other. Between the two ends is a continuum which veers towards one end or the other according to the speaker, the occasion and the environment. This chapter looks at how the process of standardization, carried out primarily by Muslim intellectuals associated modern Urdu with Islamic culture in South Asia in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in greater detail than earlier attempts in this direction. The same processes continued for both Urdu and Hindi in the twentieth century but they have not been considered in this chapter.

THE SANSKRITIC-VERNACULAR PHASE OF THE ANCESTOR OF URDU

For most of its history Hindi-Urdu been full of words now associated with Sanskritic and vernacular roots. Let us look at the most ancient texts now available. First, there are words in use at present in both Hindi and Urdu which are traceable to Sanskrit. Out of these forty-three words of daily use are given by Amrit Rai (1984: 59–63). Among these are:

āj	today
t̤o	so
thā	was
tū	you
bāt̤	words; saying
pūch	ask
yēh	this
hāth	hand

These basic words of the language in their historical forms (*Apabhranshā*) are given in texts claimed to be dating back before the Turkish armies entered India. The document from Rajput courts of the twelfth century, mentioned in an earlier context, have the words *Pardhan* and *karan* in a sample of only twenty-two words (see Note 2 of Chapter 4). However, as these dates are uncertain, since the actual texts which are available now were probably transcribed by copiers from oral narratives, let us, therefore, look at a text written by a Muslim in the Perso-Arabic script about six hundred years ago.

This is *Masnavī Kadam Rāō Padam Rāō* by Fakhar Din Nizami from the fifteenth century which has been mentioned earlier in another context (Jalibi 1973). In contrast to the few statements scattered in Persian texts referred to earlier, this is a lengthy text with 1,032 couplets. The language of this work is not Persianized or Arabicized. According to Jamil Jalibi: 'Nearly twelve thousand words have been used and out of them only about one hundred and twenty five are of Arabic and Persian'

(Jalibi 1973: 36). The rest of the diction belongs to what Jalibi calls the Hindu tradition (Hindvi *ravāet*) (Ibid., p. 37). However, the basic syntax of the language and part of the diction is still part of both Urdu and Hindi. Nevertheless, it is closer to the Hindi end of the spectrum and, therefore, may be less intelligible to non-specialist speakers of Urdu than those of Hindi. The following words are still used in Modern Hindi:

Āshtī	Ease
Utāval	Quick, one who wants results quickly.
Uttar	answer
Akkhar	word
Bintī	request
Patr	Paper
Prīt	love
Purs	man
Nār	woman
Pūt	son
Turat	immediate
Jag	world
Chamatkār	miracle
Sabd	word
Giān	wisdom
Lāb	profit
Mās	month, meat
Mūrakh	fool, ignorant
Nark	hell

The first few lines are as follows:

Gusaĩ tuhĩ ēk duna jag adār
Barōbar duna jag tuhĩ dēnāhār
Ākās ūchā pātāl dhartī tuhĩ
Jahã kuch nakoī tahã haē tuhĩ
O lord! You are the only support of both worlds

Correctly speaking you are the one who gives sustenance to both
worlds
You are the heaven and the lower part of the world
Where there is nobody; there you exist (Jalibi 1973: 65).

Out of these twenty-two words, six are not intelligible to non-
specialist speakers of Urdu. Hindi speakers may, however,
understand *ākās* (sky) as well as *pātāl* (lower part of the world).
The verb *dēnā* (giving) in *dēnāhār* (one who gives) is intelligible
to both Urdu-and Hindi-speakers but the suffix-*hār* is not used
in modern Urdu in this meaning.

This sample of the language of Deccan, during the early part
of the fifteenth century (1421–1435), as evidenced by *Kadam Rāō*,
is far less intelligible and far more Sanskritized than the
sentences of Urdu attributed to the saints in their *malfūzāt* and
tazkarās mentioned earlier. Thus, while it is not clear how people
actually spoke it, it can be said with confidence that Urdu-Hindi
was a far more Indian (Sanskritized) language from the fifteenth
till the eighteenth centuries than it is now.

While *Masnavī Kadam Rāō Padam Rāō* was written in Deccan and
the setting was Hindu, we have another text written in the
extreme north west of the subcontinent and here the setting was
Muslim. Indeed, it was intended to be a religious text by its
author. This is *Khairul Bayān* written by Bayazid Ansari
(931/1526–27—980 or 989/1572–1581) between 1560–1570, and it
also has words now associated with Hindi (Ansari 1570) (see
annexures A/5 and B/5 for the actual words). The manuscript of
the book from which the published version used here has been
printed is in Germany and is dated 1061/1650–51.[1] However, as
Akhund Darweeza (d. 1048/1638–9) has denounced Bayazid's
work for heresy in his own book, *Makhzan ul Islām*, which was
written sometime in the late sixteenth century, and finally
revised by his son Abdul Karim in its present form in 1024/1615
(Blumhardt 1905:2), it is certain that *Khairul Bayān* was in

circulation and was taken seriously enough to cause much anxiety among the ulema of the period.

The present version of <u>Khairul Bayān</u> has only sixteen lines in the language called 'Hindi' by the author, some consisting of only two words. This is probably the first Urdu writing in the Pashto-speaking area now in Pakistan (Rahman 2008 c). These 'Hindi' words are found only in the first four pages. These pages have Arabic, Persian and Pashto in equal portions. The Persian portion, however, gets reduced later while the Arabic and Pashto remain till the end. However, the Pashto version is longer than the Arabic one so that it is not an exact translation. In short, the book as it stands today, can hardly be called a book in four languages. But that is precisely what the author and his critics call it.

Bayazid himself writes in the end of the book in Pashto:

> Gorā har chē lavalī <u>kh</u>airul Bayān ū pa chār jaba ka var ba ō <u>kh</u>ēm ō dā vatā salōr jabē <u>kh</u>abar ba yē kaṛ am dā kaṛa na kaṛa la charē da har muqām (Qasmi 1967: 296–297)
> (Anyone who reads <u>Khairul Bayān</u>. I will teach him four languages, and I will give him knowledge in four languages about how to behave in all fields of life).

The first four lines which begin the book are in Arabic followed by Persian, Pashto and then 'Hindi'. The 'Hindi' words are as follows:

> Rē Bāyazīd: likh kitāb kē ā<u>gh</u>āz kē bayān jin kē sārē
> akkhar sahen bismillāh, tamām! maē na guvāū gā
> mazdūrī unhā kī jē likhē paṛan bigāṛan akkhar
> kē tamkani paṛan likhē is kāran jē sahī hōē bayān! (Qasmi 1967: 1).
> (O Bayazid: write in the beginning words all with the name of God. I will not waste the wages of those who write words without distorting them. But only if they write that which expresses the meaning correctly)

Words like *akkhar* (word), used in this book, are now associated
with Hindi but they were in use in this specimen of the ancestor
of Urdu in the North Western regions of Pakistan.

If we remember that 438 years have passed to the writing of
Khairul Bayān it is amazing that it is still intelligible to those of
us who know Urdu, Hindi, Punjabi, Siraiki, etc. Moreover, Bayazid
must have chosen it because it must have been an important
language outside the Pashto-speaking world he was living in. As
Jamil Jalibi has opined, he must have wanted to influence people
in the plains of India (Jalibi 1975: 58), and this could only make
sense on the assumption that this must have been the language
most commonly understood there as, indeed, its descendants
Urdu, Hindi and Punjabi, are even now. It appears as if Bayazid's
followers also followed his fashion of writing in more than one
language. A poet called Arzani, who was 'intelligent' and a
master of correct language (*fasīh zubān būd*), also wrote poetry
in 'Afghani, Farsi, Hindi, and Arabi' like Bayazid Ansari (Darweeza
1613: 149).

Besides these lines in the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi in *Khairul
Bayān*, at least one couplet in the same language is attributed to
Bayazid by Ali Muhammad Mukhlis (1610–11—1664–65) who is
said to be one of his followers. This occurs in Mukhlis's own
collection of Pashto verse. He introduces it in Persian as a
'couplet of Bayazid in the Hindvi language':

> *Sachchā bōl Bāyazīd kā jō banīave kōī*
> *Chū marnē paher paehlē vī par nā marē sōī*
> (Mukhlis *c*. 17th century: 581)
> (The true saying of Bayazid he who recites
> At the time of death he does not go on the path of annihilation)

Mukhlis's work—at least this poetic collection—is only in Pashto
but he lived in India for the latter part of his life and possibly
that is why words like '*anand*' (pleasure, joy, happiness)—used
even now in modern Hindi—are found in his Pashto. All the

samples of the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi given are intelligible for the modern reader.

As mentioned earlier, words like *akkhar, kāran, jīb* (tongue), are still used in some varieties of Hindi and Punjabi. Most of the other words are easily intelligible to present-day speakers of Urdu and Hindi as well as Punjabi.

About sixty-five years after *Khairul Bayān*, a book in Urdu-Hindi prose entitled *Sab Ras* (1045/1635–36) was written by Mulla Wajhi in the Deccan. Like *Khairul Bayān,* it is quite intelligible for the contemporary reader. And, in common with the works of that period, it has words of Sanskritic origin as well as some which are now obsolete. Among those which are used in Hindi even now are:

Jāpnā	to remember, to count
Chitarnā	to make pictures
Chīntā	worry
Chandan	tactics
Sarjanhār	Creator

An idea of its intelligibility can be formed by reading the following lines:

Ēk shaher thā us shaher kā naõ Sīstān is Sīstān kē bādshāh kī nāõ Aqal-dīn ō duniyā kā tamām kām us tē chaltā-us kē hukm bāj zara kĩ naĩ hiltā (Wajhi 1635: 16).
(There was a city. Its name was Sistan. The name of its king was 'Aqal. All activities spiritual and secular were carried out under his orders. Without his orders not a thing moved).

Another book by Mulla Wajhi entitled *Qutub Mushtarī*, written in 1610, has a number of Sanskrit words given by Amrit Rai (1984: 215).

All the words mentioned by Rai are also associated with Punjabi. The variety of Urdu-Hindi used in the Deccan also has

Punjabi words and certain grammatical usages (such as pluralization). Examples are:

Ākhē	said
Ānnā	to bring
Aōsī	will come
Angul	finger
Tattā	hot
Thã	place
Chiṛī	bird
Chōṛsī	will leave
Diṭhā	saw
Disē	were seen
Dūjā	Second; the other
Dīvā	lamp
(Source: Jalibi 1973: 242–265)	

The pluralization is ã as in Punjabi (*Phatrã*) and even the verbs are pluralized (*hōr aehmaqã kē batã kon kyā ētbār* = and what is the trustworthiness of the words of fools). In Urdu/õ/is used instead of/ã/.

Coming now to *Karbal Kathā* by Syed Fazal Ali Fazli (b. 1710–1711) written in during Mohammad Shah's reign (1719–1748) 1145/1732–33 and revised in 1161/1748 in North India, one finds some change from the texts we have been considering so far. The book is a translation of Husain Wa'iz Kashifi's (d. 910/1504–05 Persian work called *Rōzatul Shuhadā*. It was translated because it was read out during the meetings (*majālis*) of Muharram to lament the trials and tribulations of the martyrs of the Battle of Karbala (680 CE)[2] but, being in Persian, 'its meanings were not understood by women' (Fazli 1748: 37). Therefore, Fazli undertook this translation because, according to him, 'before this nobody had undertaken this innovation and up to now the translation of Persian to Hindi has not happened' (*ō lehzā pēsh az*

ĩ koī is sanʿat kā nahĩ huā mukhtarā'-aōr ab tak tarjumā' fārsī ba ibārat hindī nahĩ huē mustamā') (Fazli 1748: 23).

The book is a religious work and, therefore, abounds in words of Arabic as well as Persian. Yet, its author tries to use 'easy to understand Hindi' (Ibid., 38) and some words now confined to Punjabi, and even varieties of Hindi are found in it. Yet, the change is that there are more Perso-Arabic words and the linguistic style is different. As Malik Ram says: 'it is the very first sample of the language of Delhi', i.e. the new Urdu which came to be used in Delhi during this period (Malik Ram in Fazli 1748: 24).

In the Deccan Sanʿati's *Qissā Bēnazīr*, written in 1055/1645 makes two things clear: that while the scholars prided themselves upon their competence in Persian, the common people found it easier to understand Dakhni; and, that Sanskrit words were removed, at least partly because of their difficulty. Thus the author says:

> *Usē fārsī bōlnā zaōq thā*
> *Valē kē azīzã kō yũ zaōq thā*
> *Kē Dakhnī zubān sũ usē bōlnā*
> *Jo seepī tē mōtī naman rōlnā*
> (He was fond of speaking in Persian/but his loved ones had taste for Dakhni so now he is to speak in the Dakhni language/and is to roll out shells as if they were pearls) (Sanati 1645: 26).

Further, the poet tells us that he used less Sanskrit words so that by having less Persian and Sanskrit diction, his work was accessible to people who knew only Dakhni well (Ibid., 26). However, there are preambles in Arabic and, since the story is ostensibly about Tameem Ansari, a personage from early Muslim history, there are words relating to Islam, and hence, of Arabic origin. Even so, words of Hindi like '*gagan*' (sky) are also used.

Another early writer of Urdu, this time from the north, called Mohammad Afzal Gopal (d. 1035/1625), wrote a love story called

Bakat Kahānī. As it is in the Indian tradition, it is in the voice of a woman (Jain in Jafer and Jain Vol. 3, 1998: 10–34). His *Tērāh Māsā Qutbī*, copied in 1143/1730–31—the date given on the Punjab University manuscript used by the present author—is in Persianized Urdu but does have words declared obsolete later.

> *Achānak tōp kī chun rā 'ad garjā*
> *Kaṛ ak uskī jō sun kar jeu larjā*
> (Suddenly like the cannon the cloud roared/listening to its thunder the heart trembled) (Gopal 1731: n. page).

In this, while *rā'ad* is used in Persian for cloud and is originally from Arabic, '*larjā*' is the Hindi pronunciation of the Persian '*larzā*' used even now in Urdu. In short, despite the trend of Persianization of diction from the seventeenth century onwards in Dakhni and North Indian Hindi, as used by Muslim writers, words and pronunciation patterns of ordinary Hindi had not become taboo as they did later. Even more importantly the local tradition of using a woman's voice, as well as allusions to the seasons of India, is maintained. These, as we know, were also tabooed later. However, because of the Persianization of diction, Jamil Jalibi praises it as being more refined than its contemporary Muqimi's *Chandar Badan ō Mahiār* or Ghawasi's *Saif ul Mulūk Badī' ul Jamāl* (1625) (Jalibi Vol. 1, 1975: 67).

Yet another example from the same period is the *Masnavī Wafātnāmā Hazrat Fātimā* of Ismail Amrohvi written in 1105/1693–1694. It is notable because it is by a Muslim and is a religious text. Here too there is more Perso-Arabic diction than in other writings of the period but Hindi words like *sansār* (world) *mukh* (mouth, face), *ānand* (happiness), *ant* (end), *bichār* (thought), *narās* (disappointed; hopeless), and *thār* (varied), etc., also exist (Amrohvi 1694: 103). At least some of the poets of Urdu-Hindi in this early period, both Muslims and Hindus, knew Sanskrit and the local Indian languages. For instance, among others, Ahmad Gujrati who is called a '*Sha'ir-ē-Hindi*', is an expert on Sanskrit

and Bhasha (local language) (*dar 'ilm Sanskrit ō Bhākā yād tulā dāsht*') (Chandpuri 1755: 18). Sanskrit and the local languages were not tabooed as they came to be later. In short, although Perso-Arabic diction seems to have increased in works written in the Perso-Arabic script in Hindi-Urdu by the late seventeenth century, even religious texts—which have to borrow from Perso-Arabic word stock in use for religious themes—do not eschew diction now associated with Hindi. The process of weeding out words of Sanskritic origin and the local languages of India came to happen as described below in the movement for the standardization of Urdu which I call Islamization.

THE PROCESS OF ISLAMIZATION

In short, the ancestor of Urdu and Hindi does pass through two distinct phases of identity. Jamil Jalibi calls the use of Sanskritic words and allusions to indigenous (Hindu) culture the 'Hindui tradition' (Jalibi 1975: 529). The opposing trend may, therefore, be called the 'Muslim tradition' or linguistic 'Islamization'.

The movement made the following changes in the identity of the language:

1. Sanskritic words were purged out.
2. Words of local dialects were also purged out.
3. In place of the above, words of Persian and Arabic were added.
4. Literary and cultural allusions, metaphors and symbols would be predominantly to Iranian and Islamic cultures.
5. Allusions to Indian landscape were replaced by references to an idealized and conventionalized Iranian landscape.
6. The amorous conventions of Indian poetry—such as the woman expressing love for the man—were replaced by Iranian ones (i.e. a man expressing love for a beloved of indeterminate gender).

It is this new Muslimized language which became an identity symbol of the elite (*ashrāf*) community of North India.

During the process of Islamization, the excellence of literary practitioners was measured with reference to the presence of Persian and Arabic diction in their work; deviation from actual local pronunciation in orthography was taboo; and the use of Persian literary allusions, similes, metaphors, and idiomatic phrases—the rose and the nightingale of Islamic, elitist culture—rather than Hindu, mass culture were imperative.

This communalization of literary evaluation has created the illusion that Urdu was always associated with Islamic South Asian culture. This is not true as we have seen. However, there is a slow transition from the Hindu (Sanskritic) tradition to the Muslim (Perso-Arabic) one. This started in the seventeenth century during the rule of Ibrahim Adil Shah in Deccan (d. 1627) (Jalibi 1975: 252–279) and achieved momentum during the late eighteenth century.

Aspects of this process of standardization seems to be inspired or patronized by Nawab Amir Khan, the minister of the Mughal King Mohammad Shah in Delhi. A contemporary account, the *Siyār-ul-Muta'ā*k̲h̲*irīn* describes the nobleman as follows:

> He composed with great elegance and much facility, both in Persian and Hindostany poetry, often uttering extempore verses; but no man ever equalled him in the talent of saying bon mots, and in rejoining by a repartee. He possessed the art of narration in such a high degree, that people charmed with his story, kept it hanging at their ears as a fragrant flower, whose perfume they wished to enjoy for ever (Khan 1789, Vol. 3: 279).

This Amir Khan is said to have delighted in the company of learned people and patronized poets of Urdu thus contributing to its refinement. Moreover, he had created a private society which discussed words, idioms and sent the standardized version to the whole of India (Khiyal 1916: 76).

The author of *Karbal kathā*, Fazli, is also said to be part of this group and his language is much influenced by Arabic and Persian. Others, whose attempts at standardizing the Persianized style of Urdu-Hindi, in effect separating the literary and official styles of both languages, are available. They are Sirajuddin Ali Khan Arzu 1099–1169/1688—1756–57 Sheikh Zahuruddin Hatim (1699–1786), Sheikh Imam Baksh Nasikh (d. 1838) and Insha Ullah Khan Insha (1752–1818).

One of the major figures of the movement for the Islamization of Urdu is Shah Hatim who was also one of the protégés of Nawab Amir Khan. The following lines illustrate this:

> *Mumtāz kyũ na hōvē vō apnē hamsarõ mẽ*
> *Hātim ka qadardān ab Nawāb Amīr Khān haē*
> (Why should he not be distinguished among his peers
> Hatim's patron is now Nawab Amir Khan)

His book *Dīvān Zādāh* was completed in 1169/1756. In its preface (*dībāchā*) written in Persian he gives an account of his own linguistic practices as follows:

> *Lisān 'Ārabi ō zubān-ē-Fārsī kē qarībul fahem ō kasīr ul istē'māl bāshad ō rōz marrā'-e-Dehlī kē mīrzāyān-ē-Hind ō fasīhān-ē-rind dar mahāvra dārand manzūr dāshtā-zubān-e-har diyār tā ba Hindvī kē ã rā bhāka gōend mauqūf kardā- mahez rōzmarrā' kē 'ām fahem ō <u>kh</u>ās pasand būd i<u>kh</u>tiār namūdā* (Hatim 1756: 40).
> ([words out of] the Arabic and Persian languages which are intelligible and commonly used [he has used]. And the daily usage of Delhi which the gentlemen of India and the correct users of language and their idiom is acceptable. And the language of various localities and also Hindi which is called *bhākā* [the common language] has been stopped. And he has adopted that language which is used in daily life and is popularly liked and also liked by the connoisseurs of language.

The spellings prescribed by Hatim do not correspond to the pronunciation of these words in India. Rather, the ortho-graphy has to correspond to the original Arabic or Persian orthography.

مثلاً تسبیح راتسبی و صحیح راصحی و بیگانہ را بگانہ

و دیوانہ را دوانہ و مانند آں بطور عامہ

(Hatim 1756: 40)

In short, Hatim wanted the restoration of the original spellings of Arabic and Persian words.

He also specifically mentioned words of Hindi which were to be eschewed.

> *Yā alfāz-ē-Hindi kē naēn ō jag ō nit ō basar*
> *vaghaērā ānchē bāshad Yā lafz 'mār' ō 'muā' ō*
> *az ī qabīl kē bar khud qabāhat lāzim āēd.* (Hatim 1756: 40)
> Or words of Hindi like '*naēn*' (eye) or '*jag*' (world) or '*nit*' (always) and '*basar*' (to forget) etc., or like them. And words like '*mār*' (hit) and '*muā*' (dead) and words of this type should be considered contemptible.

Urdu poetry progressed through poetry meetings (*mushairās*) and teacher-pupil (*Ustādī-Shagirdī*) networks (Faruqi 1999: 144–145). In *Tabāqāt ul Shu'arā* (1188/1774–75) Qudrat Ullah Shauq writes that the poet Vali, who used to write in Dakhni was advised by Shah Gulshan when he came to Delhi that 'you should leave Dakhni and write Rekhta like the exalted language of Delhi' (*shumā zubān-ē-dakhnī rā guzāshtā rēkhtā rā muāfiq-ē-urdū-ē-mu'allā shāhjahānābād maozū bakunaed*') (Quoted from Jafer and Jain 1998 Vol. 1: 63). However, Faruqi's argument that Shah Hatim may not be solely responsible for removing Sanskrit words (Faruqi 1999: 154) is correct, as such movements are contributed to by many people, some of whom will be mentioned below. His other argument is that the classical poets, including Hatim himself,

have used many of the words they advised others to purge from the language (Faruqi 1999: 152–153). From this fact he infers that their advice was not meant seriously or that it was meant to draw a line between the language of Delhi and that of Deccan; or to make the language more inclusive. The point, however, is that the movement for purification led to exclusion, elitism and what I call Islamization of the language. On this point Amrit Rai is correct. In any case, correctness was a fad or obsession and a marker of identity (Faruqi 1999: 147). But are there any theories in the linguistic tradition of the Indian Muslims which could provide a rationale for these new linguistic trends? To answer this question we first turn to Amir Khusrau.

Amir Khusrau's Linguistic Theories

Amir Khusrau gave some of his linguistic theories in the preface to the *Dīvān Ghurrat ul Kamāl* written in the thirteenth century. Khusrau exalts the Arabic script and literature above all others but only for religious reasons. However, from the strictly poetic point of view, he considers Persian poetry superior (Khusrau 1293: 24–25). This view belongs to the medieval language ideology among Indian Muslims which categorises reality hierarchically: the language of cities is superior to that of rural areas; written language is superior to the spoken one; the language of certain elites is superior to that of ordinary people, etc. But Khusrau also adds that those brought up in India, especially in Delhi, can speak any language and even contribute to its literature while those of other places cannot (*bē ãkē mamārasat ĩ tāifā yābid tawānad kē bar tarq-ē-har kē begoend sukhanē begoed ō shunvad ō tasrafē dar nazm-ō-nasr nēz bekunad*) (Khusrau 1293: 28).

This view is heard even now among Urdu-speakers who claim that they can speak any language correctly while speakers of other languages cannot speak theirs with the same correctness of pronunciation. And a corollary of this is the excessive

significance which Urdu-speakers gave to pronunciation, idiom and diction in Urdu. The idea of this being cultural capital was taken to such absurd lengths that it was used as a weapon to humiliate those who did not conform to these prescriptive norms of correctness. The number of 'correct' speakers was reduced to some families (see Insha's views) and some exemplars were elevated above all others. Mir Mustahsan Khaleeq, a poet of Urdu, was praised by Sheikh Nasikh, one of the experts on good Urdu, as a person whose family spoke the most 'correct' Urdu (Azad *c.* 19th century: 314). The relevance of these linguistic views is that they formed part of the language ideology which informed Muslim linguists, who transferred these ideas to Urdu when it was standardized, as an icon of Muslim identity, as we shall see. One of these views might have been the linguistic superiority of Delhi which we will encounter later in the book.

Arzu's Contribution

Sirajuddin Ali Khan Arzu [1099–1169/1687–88–1755–56], known for his linguistic work on Persian and Urdu, was one of the pioneers of the reform movement which created modern Persianized Urdu. Arzu wrote a treatise on Persian linguistics called *Muthmir*. In this he emphasizes the existing linguistic ideology that the variety of Persian spoken in the cities is more correct (*fasīh*) than that of the rural areas. The relevant passage is as follows:

> *Pas ba taēhqīq pēvast kē afsāh zubānhā zubān-ē- Urdū ast*
> *ō Fārsī hamĩ jā mu'atbar ast*
> Therefore research shows that the most authentic or sophisticated among all languages is the language of the city and the Persian of this place is the most authentic... (Arzu *c.* 18th century: 13).

He also points out that all the classical poets were associated with a certain city and spoke the language of that city (*ba hamã*

zubān-ē-muqarrar harf zadand ō ã nīst magar zubān-ē-Urdū illā māshā allāh kamā sabaq) (Ibid., 13).

Arzu's views about correctness in language are found, in addition to his *Muthmir*, in his dictionary, *Navādir ul Alfāz*, finished in 1165/1751. This book was written to improve and correct an existing 'Hindi' dictionary called *Gharāib ul Lughāt* by Abdul Wāse' Hānsvī. In short, taking both the *Gharāib* and the *Navādir*, we get a peep into Urdu-Hindi before it was standardized into Urdu and Hindi.

The point which strikes a reader is that Arzu calls the language of Gwalior the most correct Hindi of all. Two sources of the middle of seventeenth century, both histories of Shahjahan, also praise Gwalior as a centre of cultivation and one explicitly considers its language the best variety of Hindi. The *Bādshāh Nāmā* of Lahori mentions a certain Raja of Gwalior who knew much about the songs and literary works of Hindustan and 'created new meanings in the language of Gwalior' (*ma 'ānī tāzā bazubān-e-Gwāliar guzārish dādāh*) (Lahori *c.* 1640s: 6). Kanboh's *Shāh Jahān Nāmā*, goes further and states categorically that 'Gwalior the language of which is the authority in Hind and Sind...' (*gavāliar kē lughat ã jā dar tamām hind ō sind sanad ast...*). In the context of Gwalior being a centre of art and literature, Arzu's high praise for the language of this region can be understood (Kanboh 1070/1659–60: 45). However, he also refers to the language of the cities of Delhi (Shāhjahānābād) and Agra (Akbarābād) as places with a desirable standard. Let us take the two claims one by one.

The assertion that the 'Hindi' of Gwalior is the best is repeated several times for instance:

(i) While explaining *Jēli* (hoe to separate grain from chaff) he says:

'Ō ba Hindi muta'ārif Gwāliar kē afsāh ul Lisanā Hindi ast'
(Arzu 1751: 187) (And in Hindi used in Gwalior which is
the best Hindi).

(ii) While explaining the meaning of *kandal* (circle; also a
game in which the players sit in a circle) he says:
*'Lēkin zubān-ē-Gwāliar kē Hindi afsāh ast badĩ ma'ānī chīl
jhapattā khuānand'* (Arzu 1751: 348) (But in the language of
Gwalior which is the most correct variety of Hindi this is
called *chīl jhapattā*).

(iii) Explaining *gāndar* (grass to make sweeps) he says:
*'Lēkin gāndar ānchē zubān zad mardam Gwāliar ō Akbarābād
kē afsāh ul Lisanā' Hindi ast Kāhē bāshad'* (Arzu 1751: 362)
(But *gāndar* in the language of the people of Gwalior and
Akbarabad, which is the most correct out of the varieties
of Hindi, is called grass).

(iv) Explaining the meaning of *īvārā* (pen to enclose animals)
he says: *'ō bazubān-ē-braj ō Gwaliar kē afsāh ast ã rā kharak
guvaēnd'* (Ibid., 48) (and in the language of Braj and
Gwalior which are the most correct it is called *kharak.*

The language of Gwalior as well as that of Agra, which Arzu
praises, is Braj Bhasha. This is the language of 'the Central Dōāb
and the country immediately to its South from near Delhi to, say,
Etawah, its headquarters being round the town of Mathura
[Muttra]' (Grierson Vol. 1, n.d.: 162). On the map of UP, the
following districts fall into Braj areas (Gautam Buddha Nagar,
Bulandshahar, Aligarh, Mahamaya Nagar, Mathura, Agra,
Ferozabad, Etah, Mainpuri, Badaun, Bareilly, and Tarai parganas
of Nainital). It is also spoken in Gurgaon, in Bharatpur and
Karauli, and in Madhya Pradesh in Gwalior and surrounding
areas. In Rajasthan, however, it slowly merges into Rajasthani
(Grierson Vol. ix: Part–1 n.d.: 69). This language had much oral
literature and a high reputation before Khari Boli, which was
standardized as Hindustani later, became ascendant.

Arzu's praise for Braj Bhasha probably owes to the fact that was born in Agra (Akbarabad) and brought up in Gwalior. His mother's family came from Gwalior and his teacher was Mir Ghulam Ali Ahsani Gwaliari. It was only in the beginning of the reign of Farrukh Siyar (r. 1713–19) that he went to Delhi (Qasmi and Mazhar 2001: 70).

But, apart from the dialect of Gwalior, which is repeatedly called the best or 'most correct' form of 'Hindi', Arzu also refers to the language of certain exalted parts of Muslim urban centres of power (Urdu) as standards. The examples are as follows:

(a) While explaining '*Chanaēl*' (woman who oggles at men surreptitiously) he says: '*Lēkin chanaēl mā'lūm nīst kē lughat-ē- kujā ast mā mardam kē az aēhlē hindēm ō dar urdūē mu'allā mī bāshēm nāshanīdā ēm*' (But one does not know where the word *Chanael* comes from for we, who are Indians and the inhabitants of the Exalted city, have not heard it) (Arzu 1751: 214).

(b) While explaining *dibā* (flesh which the camel takes out of his mouth during the rutting season) he says: '*lēkin lafz-ē-mazkūr muta'ārif Urdūē bādshāhī ō zubān-ē-Akbarābād ō Shāhjahānābād nīst...*' (but the word in question is not known in the city of the King and the languages of Agra and Delhi) (Ibid., 248–249).

(c) While explaining the connotative meaning of *rajwārā*—otherwise the place of the residence of the ruler—as a brothel he says: '*lēkin rajwārā badĩ ma'ānī istilāh- ē-Shāhjahānābād ast balkē aēhlē Urdū ast...*' (Ibid., 261). (But the word *rajwārā* in this meaning is the idiom of Delhi, indeed of the inhabitants of the exalted quarter of the City).

(d) While explaining the meaning of *gazak* (a sweetmeat) he says: '*lēkin gazak bā istilāh-e-aēhl-ē-Urdū...*' (Ibid., 371) (But *gazak* in the idiom of the inhabitants of the city...).

(e) While explaining *nakhtōṛā* (nostril) he says: '*lēkin nakhtōṛ*
    ā dar 'urf-i-Urdū va ghaērā...' (Ibid., 430). (But *nakhtōṛā* in
    the usage of the city, etc...)

(f) While explaining *haṛaphnā* (putting in one's mouth
    inelegantly) he says: '*lēkin haṛaphnā zubān-ē-Urdū ō aehlē*
    shaherhā nīst-shāēd zubān-ē-qariāt ō muvāzē' bāshad...' (Ibid.,
    441–442). (But *haṛ aphnā* is not the language of the city and
    the people of the city. Maybe it is the language of the
    towns and rural pockets)

In all these examples there is a language—meaning a variety of
the 'Hindi' language—of the exalted city (Urdu-e-Mualla)—which
is held up as a model of excellence. This is specifically associated
with Delhi and Agra and with rule (*Bādshahī*). The speakers of
this language are called '*aēhlē Shaher*' (the inhabitants of the city)
or '*aēhl-ē-Urdū*', which probably means the inhabitants of Delhi.
This is the city where the Muslim gentry, aristocracy and
workmen associated with royalty, used to live. Insha Allah Khan
Insha, as we will see, described this in detail. It is the Muslimized
idiom of the *ashrāf* which Arzu calls the 'language of Urdu'. By
Urdu he means 'city' and not a language—which is called Hindi—
though Syed Abdullah claims that he is the first writer who does
use the term Urdu for a language as has been mentioned earlier
(Abdullah 1951: 28–29). The point is that Arzu does have a
standard in mind and it is the language of an elitist Muslim
minority living in Delhi and other imperial cities.

Let us now take Arzu's condemnation of the ordinary peoples'
language which is termed as being 'wrong' or 'ignorant' or
'vulgar'—in the sense of belonging to the common people—or
being from a rural backwater. Examples abound but a few will
be sufficient:

1. While explaining *harval* (leading) he says: '*lēkin harval*
   ghalat-ē-awām ō dahāqīn-ē-Hindustān ast' (Arzu 1751: 441)

(But *harval* is the mistake of the common people and the peasants of India).

2. While explaining *mutakkā* (pillow) he says: '*nēz mutkā guvaēnd ō ĩ ghalat-ē-aēhlē Hind ast...*' (Ibid., 403). (Moreover, it is called *mutkā* and this is one of the mistakes of the people of India).

3. While explaining *kalābā* (carrier of water) he says: '*lēkin kalābā bakāf-ē-Tāzī zubān-ē-juhalā-ō-avām-ē-Hindustān ast*' (Ibid., 338). (But *kalābā* is the language of the ignorant and the common people of India).

He also explains that the people of India cannot pronounce qāf/q/(ق) (Ibid., 356); or *jīm*/dʒ/(ج) (Ibid., 174); or several other phonemes borrowed from Arabic and Persian.

If we connect this purist attitude of Arzu with his general praise for the language of the cities, and especially the centres of royal power, it becomes clear that he aspires for linguistic purity and this, in practice, means taking the Muslimized idiom of imperial Mughal cities as the new standard. The Hindi of Gwalior, while being the best variety of Hindi, is not the model which Arzu will follow. Instead, he will adopt the minority language of an elitist group, which happens to be Muslim, as the elite language which will function as the identity symbol of *ashrāf* Muslims like Arzu who will switch over from Persian to Persianized Urdu in the near future.

INSHA'S CONTRIBUTION

Another linguist whose work must have influenced the Islamization movement is Insha Allah Khan Insha, whom we have encountered several times before in other contexts. Known mostly as a poet, Insha was the pioneering sociolinguistic historian of Urdu. His pioneering work is a book in Persian entitled *Daryā-ē-Latāfat* (1802).

Insha built his whole linguistic theory around the notion of 'correctness' (*fasāhat*). This notion is based upon a hierarchical, medieval (and colonial) world-view mentioned as being part of language ideology earlier. The assumption is that the phenomenal world is a fixed and given entity with an essential nature or quality. Thus values and hierarchies within things, including languages, are an immutable given and intrinsic to their nature. Thus some languages—like some people, some religions, some races, etc.—are inferior or superior to others. The upper classes are superior to the lower ones and men are superior to women. While notions of class are found everywhere in the book, the idea of the superiority of women is given in passing as follows: 'the women of Shahjahanabad [Delhi] are the most linguistically correct women in India except men' (*zanān-ē-Shahjahānābād afsāh zanān-ē-Hindustān and sivāē mardā*' (Insha 1802: 98). The idea that human beings, or rather groups, give value and determine hierarchies which are, therefore, neither unchangeable, nor objective nor intrinsic, was not known to Insha and his contemporaries. Indeed, his British contemporaries too did not countenance such a constructionist and relativist view. They would, of course, have argued for the superiority of Europe and of English, while Insha argued for the superiority of Urdu over the other languages of India. But both parties would have agreed with the basic assumption that value (superiority or inferiority) resides in the essential nature of a thing and is not given to it by observers.

Insha developed his notion of *fasāhat* on this basic assumption—that there are superior forms of language. He then argues that the standard of correctness lies in the practice of some families of Delhi. Although he begins the book by stating that the language of the capital is the best as a general rule, he comes to a more complete definition of 'correctness' later:

> The language of Shahjahanabad is that which people attached to the royal court, courtiers themselves, beautiful women, Muslim handicraftsmen, the functionaries of rich and fashionable people—even their very sweepers—speak. Wherever these people go their children are called Dilli *wālās* and their *mohallā* is known as the *mohallā* of the Delhites (Translated from Insha 1802: 71).

Insha has been saying much the same thing from the beginning but he builds the grounds for this definition by exclusion. For instance, he excluded the Hindus arguing that it is well-known to refined people that the Hindus learned 'the art of behaviour and conversation and the etiquette of partaking food and wearing clothes from the Muslims' (*pōshidā nīst kē Hinduān salīqā dar raftār-ō guftār ō khurāk ō pōshāk az Musalmānān yad griftā and*' (Ibid., 9). Then he goes on to eliminate the working classes of Delhi and such localities as that of Mughalpura and the Syeds of Barah. The working classes, he says, speak Urdu mixed with other languages.

Some localities, such as Mughalpura, are rejected because their Urdu is mixed up with Punjabi (Insha 1802: 36). Even the Syeds of Barah, who belonged to a powerful family, are excluded on the grounds that they came from outside Delhi and were too proud to learn the correct Urdu language (Ibid., 36). After this, Insha eliminates all outsiders settled in Delhi, be they from Kashmir, Punjab or the small towns of UP. The Punjabis come in for summary rejection because of their pronunciation. In the end he is left with a few families with courtly connections and gentlemanly status (*ashrāf*). In short, correctness in Urdu is based upon the membership of an exclusive club which was Muslim, not of working-class status, and belonging to Delhi. This has been explained by Javed Majeed with reference to Insha's concern 'to define for Urdu a geographical region of its own, while at the same time ensuring that it is not tied to any one locality exclusively' (Majeed 1995: 196). However, my hypothesis is that Insha's reason is that his patron, Nawab Sa'adat Yar Khan, the

ruler of Awadh, and he himself lived in Lucknow and not in
Delhi.

This was Insha's difficulty. And he overcame it by praising the
correctness of the Urdu of Lucknow in the same rhetorical
language as he earlier praised the language of Delhi. Thus he
explains that one does not have to be born in Delhi to be correct
in Urdu. Indeed, the best Urdu-speakers (*fusahā*) of that city have
migrated to Lucknow. Since the ruler (his patron) encouraged
knowledge and the arts, it was in Lucknow that the best form of
Urdu flourished (Insha 1802: 67–71). With this stratagem he
achieves what he started out with—that correctness resides in
the language of the *ashrāf* of Delhi—but also avoids hurting egos
of the Luckhnavis and especially the Nawab. However, to be fair,
it should be added that this was also the view of other literary
figures such as Rusva, as he explains in his preface of 1887 to his
Muraqqā-ē-Lailā Majnū (Rusva 1928: footnote 1: 6–8).

Insha's linguistic theory is related to power. First, the
hierarchical and value-laden evaluation of languages or linguistic
practices in itself confirms the differentiation in society initially
created by the powerful. Secondly, Insha clearly states that
figures with temporal authority can create linguistic innovations.
For instance, the word '*rangtarā*' for '*sangtarā*', by Mohammad
Shah, is such a neologism. Insha believes that whatever form of
language is acceptable to rulers is ipso facto 'correct' (Insha 1802:
37–38). Indeed, Delhi's language is correct precisely because it
was the capital of the Mughal empire for so long. But then,
fulsome praise is given to the language of the Nawab of Lucknow
when it is claimed that every utterance reminds the author of
the *Maqāmāt-ē-Harīrī*, the model of eloquence in Arabic (*dar har
fiqrā yad az muqāmāt-ē-Harīrī mīdahad*' (Insha 1802: 37). Obviously,
Insha was trying to locate the quality of 'correctness' in the
Muslim of Delhi but pragmatism made him include the elite of
Lucknow in this charmed circle also.

Given such views about correctness Insha also believes in purging the language of course or inharmonious words. Not all these words are from Hindi though some, *sarijan, pī,* and *pītam* are. Indeed, some words are considered unreasonable (*nā māqūl*) simply because they belong to a bygone age (*mānē* for '*maẽ*'=me; *dasā* for 'seen' or 'that which was seen'; *satī* for '*sẽ*'=from, to), etc. Insha is also in favour of abandoning all words coming from the peripheral areas where Braj Bhasha or (in Lucknow) Avadhi, is spoken (Insha 1802: 33–37). He condemns such words as being unsuitable for Urdu.

Although some of Insha's ideas do not conform to traditional purist views about Urdu—for instance he argues that foreign words should be pronounced according to the phonological rules of Urdu rather than the language they are borrowed from (1802: 241)—his influence as an upholder of elitist language affected Urdu writers in the nineteenth century. And the major thrust of his elevation of the language of the Muslim elite of Delhi and Lucknow as the standard of correctness and elegance contributed to the Islamization of Urdu.

OTHER LINGUISTIC REFORMERS

The other major figure who is referred to in this process of the Islamization of Urdu is the poet Mirza Mazhar Jan-e-Janan (1701–1780). Mazhar was a poet of Persian and was also reputed to be a mystic (Sufi). According to Anwar Sadeed, who has written on the literary movements in Urdu, Mirza Mazhar carried out the linguistic reforms in the language as a religious and political duty (Sadeed 1985: 203). For him it was a religious and political necessity to have the same linguistic tradition operating in both Persian and Urdu (Ibid., 203). He was, of course, familiar with both Persian and Arabic and was a master of the Muslim mystical religious tradition. In his hands Urdu poetry developed some of the features which are associated with

the ghazal. He uses Persianized diction, Iranian literary allusions and Islamic cultural symbols.

Mirza Rafi Sauda, another classical poet, is credited by Azad for having introduced Persian idiomatic language in the local language (*bhāshā*) and, thus, having 'purified' it (Azad *c.* 19th century: 133). Another figure of this movement, Sheikh Imam Baksh Nasikh (d. 1838), spent his childhood in Faizabad and his manhood in Lucknow during a period when the Urdu-based Lucknow Shia Muslim civilization was rising. His role in standardizing Urdu has been appreciated by Ghalib. According to Safīr Bilgrami, the poet said:

> *Miã agar mujh sē pūchtē hō tō zubān kō*
> *Zubān kar dikhāyā tō Lucknow nē aōr Lucknow mē Nāsikh nē*
> (He said: 'Sir, if you ask me then it is Lucknow which made utterance into elegant language and in Lucknow it was Nasikh who did it)
> (quoted from Javed 1987: 42–43)

Imdad Imam Asar also says in *Kāshif ul Haqāeq*:

> *Sheikh nē Urdū kō tarāsh kharāsh kar aēsā kar*
> *diyā kē ab us kī latāfat aōr safāi Fārsī sē kutch kam nahĩ mā'lūm hōtī*
> (Quoted from Javed 1987: 43). (Sheikh [Nasikh] refined Urdu in such a way that its sweetness and refinement does not seem to be any less than that of Persian)

Indeed, Nasikh and his pupils—Mir Ali Rashk, Baher, Barq, Abad—are all known for giving precedence to language over meaning. According to Mohammad Hussain Azad, Nasikh had 'studied books of Persian from Hafiz Waris Ali Lakhnavi and had also studied textbooks from the ulema of Firangi Mahal. Although he did not have a scholarly command of Arabic but according to the requirements of traditional knowledge and the company of his peers he had full understanding of the requirements of poetry' (Translated from Urdu from Azad *c.* 19th century: 282).

Azad also says that he was rightly called *nāsikh* (one who cancels out something) because he cancelled out, or brought to an end, the ancient style of poetry (*tarz-ē-qadīm*) (Azad *c*. 19th century: 289). Anwar Sadeed goes to the extent of considering Nasikh responsible for the trend of purging out even well-known words of the local languages (*prākrits*) and substituting them with difficult and erudite words of Persian and Arabic (Sadeed 1985: 211). However, Rashid Hasan Khan, in his 'Introduction' to the selection of Nasikh's verse, while agreeing that Nasikh did use difficult Arabic words, attributes this trend to the lack of depth in his work which verbosity is intended to conceal (Khan 1996: 34–69). Moreover he claims that the students of Nasikh and not the poet himself carried out most of the linguistic purges which are attributed to him. However, Nasikh did make Lucknow a centre of the ongoing standardization of Urdu (Ibid., 70–109).

One of the sources describing the linguistic reform movement is *Jalwā-ē-Khizr* (1884). Its author, Farzand Ahmad Safeer Bilgrami, aspires to write a history of Urdu poetry like Azad's *Āb-ē-Hayāt*, and for this purpose he chose the extended metaphor of committees. The focus is the refinement of Urdu diction and there are eight committees for this purpose. The first was by Shah Hatim, the second by Mir Taqi Mir, the third by Jurat, the fourth by Mushafi, the fifth by Insha, the sixth by Mir Hasan (1736–7—1786), the seventh by Shah Naseer (1756–1839), and the eighth by Ibrahim Zauq (1789–1854) and Momin Khan Momin (1800–1851). There were also sub-committees by the students of the last two and Ghalib (Bilgrami 1884: 273). Of course there were no formal committees of this kind but the metaphor is useful for categorizing the major figures who participated in what was seen as the refinement of the language. A number of lists are given which suggest that the major change was of fashion, i.e. the old-fashioned word or expression was substituted by a new one. In many cases only the grammatical gender was changed (in *tāsīr kiyā* [affected] the last word which refers to the gender of the

verb 'did' became *kī*, i.e. feminine). However, well-known words of Hindi origin, which are still used in modern Hindi and especially in popular songs, were declared obsolete. Among these are: *naēn* (eyes), *darshan* (vision), *sajan* (friend), *jag* (world), *mōhan* (darling), *dārū* (medicine/alcohol), *sansār* (world), *piyā* (beloved), *sarījan* (deity), *pītam* (beloved), *mukh* (mouth), *prēm* (love), etc. (Bilgrami 1884: 73–74). However, Mir Dard, Mirza and Sauda, etc., did throw out some 'typical words of Hindi' (*thēth Hindi alfāz*) from their poetic work (Ibid., 91).

Even so, it should be clarified here that this movement for purging the existing 'Hindi' language of words was not seen as Islamization at that time nor is it called that by historians of Urdu. As mentioned earlier, if one examines the lists of words rendered obsolete by this movement of linguistic purification one finds that most words were discarded simply because they were old fashioned, rustic or grammatically mixed (one morpheme from Arabic another from Hindi or Persian or some such combination). Thus Khalid Hasan Qadri's glossary of 4,000 obsolete words has items which are not of Sanskritic origin but fell from grace for other reasons (Qadri 2004). Other lists of obsolete words are provided by Shauq Neemvi, Abra Hasni and Khurshid Lakhnavi, among others (Baloch 2008: 219–225). Most of the words and expressions in these lists are not of Sanskritic or local language (*bhasha*) origin but are simply old fashioned (*āē haē* (comes), *jāē haē* (goes), *lījō* (take), *dījō* (give), or of the wrong Persian construction (*khandā jabīn* is obsolete and in its place *khandāh jabīn* is allowed, i.e. the *hē* < ح > is to replace the *alif* < ا >) (Baloch 2008: 121). The fact that speakers of Urdu actually use the *alif* is of no account for the purists. The practitioners of the movement considered it linguistic reform and that is how the historians of Urdu describe it even now. Even a recent work, Imtiaz Hasnain's thesis, is entitled 'standardization and modernization of languages', and he describes the same movement (Hasnain 1985). In contemporary India, 20.51 per cent

people still consider the Urdu of Lucknow and Delhi as the standard (Ibid., 122). But this discussion of the 'standard' conceals the Islamization of the language which created Modern Urdu out of Hindi-Urdu.

It is obvious to any discriminating researcher, however, that the major role of the movement was that of a class marker. The language ideology of the time valued Persian over the local languages so, if a local language had to be used, it had to be embellished with Persianate vocabulary and constructions in order to gain acceptance among elitist circles. Thus, when Mir Mohammad Hussain Taehsin wrote his *Naō Tarz-ē-Murass'ā*', the tale upon which Meer Amman's *Bāgh-ō-Bahār* is based, he said he would write it in 'colourful Hindi'. As this tale was written, according to Nurul Hasan Hashmi, in 1775 (Hashmi 1958: 31) the word Urdu was not used—or, at least, was not commonly used—for the language. Thus, Taehsin uses the word Hindi but makes it clear that he was using an experimental form which 'in the past nobody had invented' and the novelty lay in embellishing ordinary Hindi with ornamental Persian and thus making it fit to be accepted as an offering to a ruler (Nawab Shuja ud Daulah of Lucknow) (Taehsin 1775: 54). This was a time of insecurity for the Muslim elite which had earlier prided itself on the foreign Persian. Now that they had to adopt an indigenous language, a language of India, it had to take as many non-Indian and non-rustic elements as possible to make it appropriate. Rusticity (*ganwārpan or ganwārū*) was something to be shunned both by the creators of modern Urdu and later Modern Sanskritized Hindi. One reason why Braj Bhasha was discarded and Khari Boli preferred for creating Hindi, as an editorial put it, was 'Braj Bhasha is used mainly by illiterate rustics, but Khari Hindi is used by well-educated both for speaking and writing' (*Hindusthan* 3 April 1888). Rahul Sankrityayan, one of the most accomplished historians of Hindi, tells us that the devaluation of the local for fear of rusticity facilitated the entry of words of Sanskrit, (quoted

from Rai 2001: 81). Another reason for the hunt for Sanskritic diction was, of course, that Khari Boli was the base for Urdu too. As Alok Rai puts it: 'the relationship with Urdu is embarrassingly manifest, that with Sanskrit is largely mythical' (Rai 2001: 82). And in both cases the reform movements followed the same trajectory; they moved away consciously from rusticity, locality and to an idealised construction corresponding to new identities which were in the process of construction. But to admit to having political aims, or even being conscious of identity politics, is not the perception of writers, poets and linguists. Hence the insistence that the movements for the Islamization and Hinduization of Khari Boli are not political acts but are merely linguistic reform movements.

The Institution of Poetic Apprenticeship

As mentioned earlier, among the institutions which Islamized Urdu, was poetic apprenticeship or mentorship (*shāgirdī ustādī*). Poets became disciples or students of established practitioners or teachers (*usātizā* sing. *ustād*) who corrected their poems according to the established criteria of correctness and eloquence (*fasāhat ō balāghat*) (Baloch 2008: 57–77). These poets acted as the 'language guardians' whose attitude 'to the use of vocabulary is an important aspect of prescriptivism' (Gustafsson 2008: 85). By prescribing what diction to use they cultivated a language ideology which was disseminated to the young aspiring poets, their hearers and all those who professed to possess literary taste. Deviation from these prescribed norms was punished by social obloquy and stigmatized as lack of taste, philistinism and ignorance. The *mushā'irā* (poetry recitation meeting) was a site of such sanctions. According to C.M. Naim 'Every master poet had his loyal disciples (šāgird) and their numbers and names were matters of prestige. These disciples attended musha'iras in the company of their masters, and were quick to rectify, verbally or otherwise, any loss of face' (Naim 1991: 168). And one of the

things which never went uncorrected was any deviation from the standard language. That is why the hold of the standard language, the new Islamized Urdu carefully cultivated by the Urdu poets, was so strong and correction was its driving force.

Prosody was one aspect of this correction but the focus was always diction. Obsolete words and expressions had to be eschewed and one had to be careful about the accepted idiom among ones' seniors. As the novice poet had to recite his poems in a *mushāirā* which is an assembly of other poets—all potential or actual rivals—words acquired a meaning which they could not in cultures in which poetry was a private matter. It was because the performance was public and so completely dominated by Muslim *usātizā* that the cultural references of Persian and Indian Muslim culture saturated Urdu poetry after this movement and the space for using local and Hindu references disappeared in all genres except the *dōhā*. Thus, the movement for linguistic reform which was not consciously meant to communalize Urdu actually ended up doing just that.

Discursive Pattern and Identity

As mentioned above, what changed the identity of Urdu from a composite language of Hindus and Muslims to a language of urban Muslims was not only the expurgation of certain words. Much more significant was the fact that the overall discourse became oriented to elitist Indian Muslim culture. Thus the themes, cultural references, formulaic utterances, salutations, religious allusions, and the overall atmosphere came from Islam as practiced in North India. This is something which made it difficult for Hindus—at least those who wanted their literary products to function in an overall Hindu and Indian oeuvre—to keep writing in Urdu. This fact is not usually acknowledged by Muslim scholars—something which Gian Chand Jain complains about (Jain 2005: 200–215)—but judging from the praise, some of the greatest modern day scholars of Urdu have lavished on the

Islamization of discourse, it was and still is considered a welcome development. Indeed, writing at present, Moinuddin Aqil says that Mirza Mazhar Jan-e-Janan's achievement was to prevent the domination of the influences of Hindi (*Hindi asrāt kō Urdū adab mẽ ghālib ānē sē rōknā thā*) and that the movement brought Urdu closer to Persian and Muslim cultural values (Aqil 2008: 58).

Examples can be multiplied but the point is clear that some of the twentieth century paradigmatic scholars of Urdu believe that the discursive elements of Urdu should belong to the urban, middle class culture of North Indian Islam. All their talk of Muslim 'emotions', 'values' and cultural references alluded to in the previous chapter, created a certain literary culture in which it was not possible for a writer to choose a non-Muslim cultural style to express himself or herself. This explains why Mohammad Hussain Azad's famous history of Urdu literature *Āb-ē-Hayāt*, ignores both Hindu poets and women—the dice was loaded against them as Urdu had been standardized from the eighteenth century onwards to become an identity symbol of North Indian Muslim males of the *ashrāf* class.

There were attempts to reverse the trend of Islamization during the Urdu-Hindi controversy period by those who wanted Muslim-Hindu unity. Waheeduddin Saleem, a minor literary and academic figure in Hyderabad, was one of these people and, among other things, he said that Hindi words, allusions to Hindu mythology and culture and references to India rather than Persia, should be added to Urdu in order not to alienate our 'Hindu brethren' (Saleem *c*. 20th century: 6–8). More famously, Sir Syed, one of the pioneers of the anti-Hindi reaction during the Hindi-Urdu controversy, deplored the tendency of using the idiom and diction of Persian. He said these two things made 'the Urdu-ness disappear' (*unsē Urdūpan nahĩ raēhtā*) (Khan 1847: 427). Syed Sulaiman Nadvi also pointed out that there were hundreds of 'beautiful' words of Hindi in Urdu poetry before Ghalib and Momin but they had been declared unidiomatic. He suggests

making a dictionary of pure (*thēt*) Hindustani words (Nadvi 1939: 75 and 91–92). However, as linguistic symbols feed into narratives of identity, this Islamization continued with the result that Urdu is now seen as solely a Muslim language. Indeed, the opposite trend which produced glossaries of purely Persian and Arabic words such as the *Farhang-ē-'Amirā* in 1937, continues even now so that the National Language Authority has not only reprinted this dictionary in 1989 and again in 2007 (Khaveshgi 1937) but continues to create technical terms (neologism) in mostly incomprehensible Perso-Arabic vocabulary.

Social Implications of Islamization

One major tradition of Urdu linguistics is: preoccupation with 'correctness' (*fasāhat*) and this is seen through the criterion of what I call Islamization. This trend has ideological associations and implications for identity, self-definition, and ultimately, politics. The notion of correctness makes it possible to create a certain aristocracy of the 'owners of language' (*ahl-ē-zubān*). This serves the purpose of making the language an exclusive preserve of an elitist group distinguished from others by its birth, upbringing and education in the norms of the 'correct' language. By the same token it is a device which excludes non-native speakers of Urdu; the less than perfect speakers; the 'Others'. These 'others' can, of course, learn Urdu but they will always fall short of the perfection of the *ahl-ē-zubān*. As to who were the *ahl-ē-zubān* is contested and that is exactly what Insha tries to do; he demarcates them from the 'others'. In short, the notion of 'correctness' imbues Urdu with the kind of value which makes it a rare and valued commodity. This is best explained with reference to Bourdieu's concept of 'linguistic capital'"

> The constitution of a linguistic market creates the conditions for an objective competition in and through which the legitimate competence can function as linguistic capital, producing a *profit of*

distinction on the occasion of each social exchange [emphasis in the book] (Bourdieu 1982: 55).

This capital is 'capital' only as long as its value is recognized in the society in which it operates. In this case it was so recognized and, lacking political power, the *ahl-ē-zubān* jealously guarded the purity of their usages so as to keep the value of this capital intact. There are many anecdotal incidents, especially of the poet Josh Malihabadi, of rebuking people who did not speak Urdu, according to the usages he considered correct. But, as identities are in a state of flux and are always being constructed, the notion of linguistic capital keeps changing. When Hindu-Muslim politics necessitated an emphasis on unity rather than separation, both groups adjusted their linguistic performances. For instance, Syed Sulaiman Nadvi points out that between 1919 and 1925, at the height of the Khilafat Movement, Muslim speakers used typically Hindi words in their speeches and vice versa (Nadvi 1939: 93).

To conclude, the standardization of Urdu in the late eighteenth century made modern Urdu highly Persianized and Arabicized. There were two aspects of this standardization: the removal of certain words of colloquial, indigenous or Indic origin and substituting them with the words of Persian and Arabic. This was called the linguistic reform movement but it did not purge away only Indic words. Indeed, it removed many more words used in the composite language of the time, which were merely old-fashioned or considered unrefined, even if they were originally borrowed from Persian and Arabic and then naturalized into Urdu-Hindi. The movement probably had more to do with class than with religion to begin with. This point is generally ignored— Amrit Rai, for instance, ignores it—though it has been mentioned by Krishna Kumar who notes that, as a result of purification, Urdu became a '"class dialect" of a nervous aristocracy' (Kumar 1991: 136). It so happened that this 'nervous aristocracy' was either Muslim or culturally steeped in Muslim traditions. Thus,

the overall effect of the linguistic reform movement was to create a discourse which favoured the Muslim ways of thinking, feeling and describing reality. These discursive imperatives drew upon Muslim cultural values and used Islamic cultural references in such a manner that they became literary imperatives which the tradition of poetic apprenticeship imposed upon all literary practitioners. Later on, other imperatives, such as the necessity of aligning oneself to the antagonistic and hegemonic Muslim or Hindu identities during the freedom movement of the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries, took over. Krishna Kumar could be right when he claims that the 'reaction to this identification [of Urdu with Islam] took the only available form of associating Hindi and the Nagri script with Hinduism, and of its "purification" by the removal of words of Arabic-Persian lineage' (Kumar 1991: 136). However, it should not be forgotten that the first movement (Persianization) was a class movement to begin with while the second (Sanskritization), even if a reaction, was a political and communal one. Thus, Urdu and Hindi kept drawing apart till now their formal, high literary registers are mutually unintelligible. Yet, the common peoples' language in the streets of Delhi and Karachi are mutually intelligible.

NOTES

1. The author visited the University of Tuebingen in June 2010 and was told that the manuscript had been sent to Berlin. The record of the library indicates that the Mss was of 167 pages and was written by Faqir Bahar Tavi.
2. The battle of Karbala (in present-day Iraq) took place on 9 or 10 October 680 CE between Husain (son of Ali) and Yazid I (son of Muawiya), the Umayyad Caliph. Husain was killed and his martyrdom is commemorated every year in Muharram especially by the Shia sect of Islam.

Extract in Urdu-Hindi

Annexure-A/5

The lines as given in the edited version of the manuscript of _Khairul Bayān_ are as follows:

رے بايزيد! لکھ کتاب کے آغاز کے بيان جن کے سارے اکھر سہن بسم اللہ، تمام؛ ميں نہ گنوانو نگا
مزدوری انہن کی ہے لکھيں پرن بگارپن اکہر کہ تمکنی پرن لکھيں اس کا رن ہے سہی ہوئے بيان....

...

رے بايزيد! لکھ وہ اکھر ہے سب جيب سہن جڑ تھميں؛ اس کارن ہے نفع پاؤن ادميان؛ توں سجان
ہے کچ کا ميں نابہں جانتا بن قراان کے اکھر رے سجان!
رے بايزيد! لکھنا اکھر کا تجھ سی ہے، دکھلاونا اور سکھلاونا مجھ سی ہے، لکھ ميرے فرمان سہن جيوں اکھر
قراان کی پہن کی پہن، لکھ کوئی اکھر اور پر تمکنا کہ جزم کہ وہ اور نشان ہے وہ اکھر پچھانہن ادميان؛ لکھ
کوئی اکھر چار چار عيان درہاں سکھنے ہے پڑھين تو سانس نکالہن کوئی دويں بچا اکھر سہن ادميان!

(The meanings are as follows):

O Bayazid: Write in the beginning of the book all words correctly in the Name of God. I will not let the wages of those be lost who read without spoiling or making mistakes even a word for this reason that the narrative be authentic.

O Bayazid: Write those words which fit the tongue for this purpose that you find benefit, O Men!
              You are the Pure and Elevated One. I know not anything but words of the Qur'an O Pure One!

O Bayazid: Writing of the words is from You, to show and to teach is from Me. Write my sayings words wearing the forms of the writing of the Qur'an, Write some words and put on them diacritical marks so that the readers recognize words, O Men! Write some words in four forms clearly in them. So that they learn quickly and intone with breath. Some two words out of them O Men!?

The question mark (?) indicates that the meaning is not clear to this author.

(Ansari 1570 in Qasmi 1967: 3)

Separate Lines In Urdu-Hindi

Annexure-B/5

The following phrases and words are dispersed on pages 3 and 4 of _Khairul Bayān_.

Alif is One	الف ایک ہے
This is the narrative	ہے بیان
Read O! Men!	پڑھن آدمیان!
If you recognize then understand	پہچانہیں تو جان
The truth is manifest	سچ ہے عیان
Read what is on the tongue	پڑھو جیب پہن از زبان
It is understood by blessed men.	اسے سمجھیں سبحان آدمیان
All of them learn [it].	سکھن تمام

(Ansari 1570 in Qasmi 1967: 1–4).

There is no Hindi after p. 4 of the printed version available to this author.

6

Urdu as an Islamic Language

We have seen how the standardization of Urdu is associated with the Muslim identity. This chapter shows how the language came to be associated with Islam itself in South Asia. Relevant for these purposes is the use of Urdu in Islamic writings, teaching in the Islamic seminaries (madrassa*s*) and, of course, the use of the language as a symbol during the freedom movement which resulted in the creation of Pakistan.

Unlike Arabic, Urdu is not considered sacrosanct in itself though it is written in the script of Persian (*nastālīq*) which, in turn, is based on the Arabic one (*naskh*). However, Khurshid Ahmad, an ideologue of the Jamā'at-i Islāmī in Pakistan, begins his seminal essay on Islamic literature in Urdu in the *Tarīkh-ē-Adabiāt*, with the claim that 'after Arabic the biggest treasure of religious Islamic literature is in Urdu' and that from the middle of the nineteenth century onwards, Muslim thought in the subcontinent has been in this language (Ahmad 1972: 261). Khurshid Ahmad's claims are substantially true and this chapter looks at the religious texts written during this period which weakened the association of Urdu with other factors, especially the amorous and the erotic, and associated it with Islam and Muslim identity in the subcontinent.

THE ASSOCIATION OF URDU WITH ISLAM IN PRE-PARTITION INDIA

Urdu was not initially associated with Indian Islam though it was used for preaching to those who were illiterate in Persian since the sixteenth century at least. Although there was a debate in Islam about whether any language but Arabic could be used for worship or other sacred purposes, other languages were used for quasi-religious purposes as soon as non-Arabs converted to Islam. Persian was part of the Islamic culture and Muslim identity in India because it was the language of the dominant elite. When this elite lost its political power in the wake of British colonialism, it consolidated its cultural power through Persianized Urdu. However, Urdu-Hindi had been in use by Islamic preachers, Sufis and holy men since the medieval age. Let us turn to this aspect of the language now.

EARLY INDIAN SUFI WRITING IN URDU

The Sufis had started using the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi in informal conversation and occasional verses, as attested by the *malfūzāt* and the *tazkaras* cited earlier in other contexts. Some of them were said to recite verses in Hindi. For instance, Sheikh Rizqullah (897/1491–92—997/1588–89), is said to have recited couplets in Hindi and written a treatise (*risālā*) in that language 'and its name in Hindi is Rajan and in Persian Mushtaqi' (*va nām-ē- īshān dar Hindi rājan ast ō dar fārsī mushtāqī*') (Dehlavi 1862: 163–64). Sheikh Burhan Kalpi was famous for his Hindi *dōhrās* (a poetic genre) (Ibid., 267), while Sheikh Abdullah Abdal Dehlavi, who was a *majzūb*, 'used to dance in the market-place and recite couplets in simple Hindi relevant to the situation' (*dar bāzār raqs kunan ō dōhrāhē hindi sadā māfiq-ē-hāl guftī*' (Ibid., 272). For a recent (nineteenth century) example of the way they used the local languages, it is instructive to read the *malfūzāt* of Khwaja Ghulam Farid (1845–1901), who lived in the present Siraiki-

speaking area. Mohammad Ruknuddin, the compiler of the *malfūzāt*, gives many instances of his mentor's own Siraiki verses recited during poetry and musical sessions (*mehfil-ē-samā'a*). Moreover, songs in 'Hindi' were also sung. For instance, a certain sufi called Sayyid Turab Ali, during the *maghrib* prayers, started singing the following *'thumrī'*: *'nēki lagat mohẽ apnē sayyã kī ānkh rasīlī lāj bharī rē'* (beautiful appears to me my lover's eye filled with nectar and bashfulness) (Ruknuddin 1926–27: 23). As there is mention of similar musical sessions and the singing of 'Hindi' songs it is evident that the Sufis patronized, or at least encouraged, singing in the local languages.

Khwaja Banda Nawaz Gesu Daraz is said to have given sermons in Dakhni Urdu since people were less knowledgeable in Persian and Arabic and several works in Hindvi are attributed to him (Shareef 2004: 59). According to Jamil Jalibi, however, Gesu Daraz could not be the author of these works (Jalibi 1975: 159–160). However, whether these particular writings are by Gesu Daraz or not, he did know the languages of India. This is suggested by the conversation of 28 Sha'bān 802/1400, when the Saint make it clear that he conversed with Brahmins and knew the religious books of the Hindus and the Sanskrit language very well (Hussaini 1401: 218–219). He also discussed 'Hindi' songs on the first of Ramzān 802/1400, but it is not clear whether this refers to Dakhni or some South Indian Dravidian or other language (Hussaini 1401: 238).

However, even if Indian languages, including the ancestor of Urdu and Hindi, were used by the saints in their conversation, they were not considered appropriate for religious writing. Thus Shah Miran Ji (d. 1496) writes in a didactic poem in Hindvi that this language was like a diamond one discovered in a dung heap. He makes it clear that the poem is intended for those who neither knew Arabic nor Persian. Then, in easy Hindvi verse, which contemporary Urdu readers can understand with some effort, the author explains mysticism in questions and answers

(Haq 1939: 48–50). His son, Shah Burhanuddin Janum, wrote a Hindvi poem in 1582. He too apologizes for writing in Hindvi but argues that one should look at the meaning, the essence, rather than the outward form (Ibid., 62–63). In short, the Sufis used the local languages for the dissemination of their message just as the medieval friars used the European vernacular languages in Europe. As Kehnel puts it:

> One seems to agree that in England as in the rest of late medieval Europe, preachers made regular use of the vernacular when actually delivering their sermons. They did however—at least in writing—develop a specific bilingual jargon, a style generally referred to as Macaronic, which functioned somewhere in between the written Latin text and the spoken vernacular word (Kehnel 2006: 94)

In the case of medieval India, for the Muslim Sufis, a similar process was at work and the couplets in Rekhta—meaning that half a line or a full line is in Persian and the other in Hindvi—attributed to many of them, are a parallel development.

Yet another practice which disseminated the local languages in addition to Persian which was normally in use in formal domains—was music or *sama'ā*, which has been mentioned in other contexts several times already. The sufis held musical evenings (*mefil-ē-sama'ā*) in which 'Hindi' songs were heard. The conversation of 7 Ramzan 802/1400 of Sheikh Geru Daraz records that a certain Hasan Mehmandi said '*sohla mai sohla*' in Hindi in such a musical evening. The meaning given in the book is: 'o my mother! Happiness and music are His' (Hussaini 1401: 270). Khawaja Naseeruddin Chiragh Delhvi is reported to have reached ecstasy upon hearing both Hindi and Persian couplets on 10 Muharram 803/1400 (Hussaini 1401: 532). Khwaja Gesu Daraz's father told him on 21 Safar 803/1401 about a sufi who was older than him—this takes us back to the early fourteenth century—who got in such ecstasy upon singing the Hindi song *ohnū sa maddiā khan shrā mākar huā* that a needle penetrated his foot

causing such excessive bleeding that he died (Hussaini 1401: 553).[1]

The attitudes of these fifteenth and sixteenth century mystics is similar to that of the Mahdavis—pioneers of a new religious sect—who followed the teachings of Syed Muhammad Mehdi of Jaunpur (1443–1505), which were considered heretical at that time. In a poem written between 1712 and 1756 in Hindvi, the Mahdavis say that one should not look down upon Hindi as it is the commonly used language for explanation (Shirani 1940 in 1987: 207). That this language was considered useful for religious preaching is evidenced by Bayazid Ansari's use of it in his book *Khairul Bayān*, written by the end of the sixteenth century. As this book and its author have been discussed in detail earlier they need not detain us here. Suffice it to say that the language was used in the extreme North West of the subcontinent by a man who fancied he was giving a new interpretation of Islam. There were also a large number of versified stories on what may be called folk Islam or popular Islam in 'Hindvi' in circulation: these were on the Prophet of Islam's [PBUH] radiance or spiritual essence (*Nūr Nāmās*) or his passing away (*Wafāt nāmās*); on the battle of Karbala (*Jang Nāmās*, *Karbālā Nāmās*); life after death (*Lahad nāmās*) and holy personages (such as *Bībī Fatimā*). They proliferated in the Deccan during the seventeenth century. Jamil Jalibi tells us that they were read out and people believed that such recitations would make their wishes come true (Jalibi 1975: 493–496). The other favourite theme referred to previously, was the *Pand Nāmā*, a book which explained the rituals and rudimentary principles of Islam. These can be called the *Sharia'h* guide books and can be seen in the catalogues of the British Library (Blumhardt 1926; and Quraishi and Sims-Williams 1978).

The medieval Sufis, once again like the friars of medieval Europe, were members of a universal, international order which tied them to the Muslim world especially the Persianate one. But

they lived in India and participated in the life of the community around them. The language of this international order was Persian and Arabic, while those of the local communities around them were the Indian languages of the common people. This is paralleled by the Franciscan friars who also lived 'in-between' lives, sandwiched as they were between 'the Latin world of their order and the multilingual world of regional issues'. But this kind of existence 'was the precondition for the friars' active participation in local and trans-local discourses' (Kehnel 2006: 105). Such conditions probably prevailed in medieval India too and produced both local discourses in the local languages and trans-local ones in Persian and sometimes in Arabic.

RELIGIOUS WRITING DURING COLONIAL RULE

Two factors increased religious writing in Urdu during the colonial era. First, printing made it possible to produce and disseminate many more copies of religious works than the copiers of handwritten manuscripts could ever imagine. As this effect of printing will be given detailed attention in Chapter 12, it will only be mentioned in passing here. Both in the present day Uttar Pradesh area as well as the Punjab, religious literature remained neck to neck with poetry and fiction as far as the themes of the printed works is concerned (see Annexure-A of Chapter 12).

Even the literary compositions were often on religious subjects, so one could argue that the dissemination of religious themes was the most significant consequence of printing in India. This was an activity in which both the Hindu and the Muslim communities indulged. However, the reports speak more often of Muslim activity because, as one report puts it, 'works on history and biography are generally semi-religious' in their case (Adm. NWP and O 1901: 189).

The second factor was the military defeat and the political, economic, intellectual, and psychological domination of the

British over Indians this entailed. The Muslims reacted to this in three ways: militarily, by emphasizing their religious identity and purifying their religious practices, and by cooperating with the colonial masters and accepting various degrees of assimilation and Anglicization. The ones who coped with the colonial onslaught by reinventing religious identity were the strict monotheists like Shah Waliullah (1703–1762) and the Ahl-i-Hadith who believed that Indian Islam could only be reformed by removing all traces of polytheism (*shirk*) and innovations (*bidā*). For this purpose, knowledge of the fundamental sources of religion—the Quran and the Hadis—had to be translated into Urdu in order to make them accessible to the common people.

THE QURAN AND ITS EXEGESES IN URDU

The reformers felt that the message of the Quran should be propagated widely among the common public. Hence there was an emphasis on making it available to the common people in Urdu. Shah Waliullah is a pioneer of this trend. His movement of Islamic reform of Indian Muslim society is closely linked to Urdu (Aqil 2008: 120–128). Although he himself wrote in Arabic and Persian, he encouraged his son Shah Abdul Aziz to learn idiomatic Urdu (Rizvi 1982: 77). This was probably because Urdu was so commonly used among the urban Muslims of North India by this time that it was a better vehicle for reforming Indian Muslims than either Persian or Arabic. His other sons, Shah Abdul Qadir (1753–1827) and Shah Rafiuddin (1749–1817), translated the Quran into Urdu (Rizvi 1982: 104–105).[2] An earlier venture initiated by J.B. Gilchrist was forbidden by the government in 1807 because the ulema had been highly incensed even with Shah Waliullah's Persian translation and were not likely to countenance an Urdu one (Siddiqi 1979: 155–157). Indeed, the fundamentalist preachers, called Muhammadis by Harlan Pearson in his study of the Tariqa-i Muhammadyah—also called Wahhabis—recognized the value of Urdu in popularizing

their reformist message (Pearson 2008: 60–81: also see Farooqi, K.A., n.d.). Some Englishmen did get the Quran translated into Urdu for their benefit. One such case is that of William Wright who was posted to Farrukhabad at Camp Fatehgarh. Here he met Syed Waliullah who translated the Quran for him in Persian in 1243/1837, in what he calls Hindi. There are four columns in the manuscript: the first in Arabic, the second in Persian, the third in Hindi (Tarjumā Hindī), and fourth, which is blank, is for English. In the copy in Heidelberg University Library there is a note by William Wright as follows:

> This copy of the Koran in the Arabic, Persian and Hindoostanee langues [sic], was compiled for my use by Syyud, Mooftee, Wallee Ollah Expounder of Mosulman Law and a native judge of the Furkhabad Zillah Court. A profound Arabic Scholar, upright judge, virtuous and amiable man, and a zealous, but not intolerant Mosulman (Waliullah 1837).

But, of course, most translations were meant for the Muslims themselves.

Exegeses came to be written as early as the end of the sixteenth century and some of the early ones are anonymous. Gujarat and Deccan fare prominently as centres of Islamic writing in this early period (Naqvi 1992: 23). A notable attempt is that of Murad Ullah Ansari Sanbhli, who gives reasons for having written his exegesis *Tafsīr-ē-Murādī* (which ended in 1771). Sanbhli argues that, since millions of people spoke Hindi and were keen to learn from his explanations of the holy book, he was requested by many of his companions to write his explanations for them. He therefore undertook the writing of this exegesis (Naqvi 1992: 25–26). He ends his work by thanking God for having made it possible for him to write an exegesis of a portion of the Quran in the Hindi language ('*um sipārē kī tafsīr Hindī zubān mẽ tamām karvā dī*') (Sambhli 1875: 387). This, however, was the period (middle of the eighteenth century)

when there was a great increase in religious writings in Urdu. While the popular poems such as *Nūr Nāmās* and *Jang Nāmās* continued to be written, serious prose literature—translations of the Quran and the Hadis, exegeses, collections of legal judgments (*fatāwā*)—now started supplementing Persian works in these genres. Such literature is described in some detail by Gaborieau (1995), Ayub Qadri (1988), Naqvi (1992), and Khan (1987), but a study with reference to its production and consumption still needs to be undertaken.

Sometimes the exegeses of the Quran, said to be in 'Hindi', are actually in a language which is Urdu mixed with Punjabi, such as Maulvi Deen Mohammad's *Tafsīr Qur'ān Majīd Bazuban-ē-Hindi* (Mohammad n.d.). Mostly, however, Hindi means Urdu, as in Maulvi Ikram Uddin's *Tōhfatul Islām: Tafsīr Sūra' Fatehā* (1308/1890–91). Some manuscripts have two works in them—one in the centre of the page and the other on the margins. For instance the *Tafsīr Sūra' Taēhrīm* has the '*Silk Nūr Masnavī*' on the margin and the exegesis of a verse of the Quran in the centre (Ismail n.d.).

But, while such learned works were read by the clergy and only a few other people, the pamphlets described below spread far more widely.

THE SHARIAH GUIDEBOOKS

This genre is further divisible into the philosophical guidebook and the practical ones. The first refutes what the authors call false beliefs and emphasizes upon the right ones. The latter sub-genre is less concerned with intellectual arguments about doctrines. These simply instruct the believer into rituals, practices, worship, and the required behaviour of a practicing Muslim.

The paradigmatic work of the philosophical kind is Shah Ismail's (1779–1831) Persian work whose Urdu translation is entitled *Taqwiat ul Īmān* [The Strengthening of Belief] (1876).[3] The

book was originally written in Persian and then translated into Urdu by Mohammad Sultan Khan. It was he who gave it this title. According to its translator the language used in this book is the commonly understood 'Urdu' (Ismail 1876: 226). Another book attributed to the same author is *Sirāt-ē-Mustaqīm* [The Straight Path]. It too was translated from Persian into Urdu by Abdul Jabbar. It describes the philosophy of divine love along with stringent condemnation of the social ceremonies of Indian Muslims (Ismail 1319/1901–2).

Another important text of this genre is Khurram Ali's (d. 1855) *Nasīhat ul Muslimīn* (1822). He begins the book by saying that he wanted to refute polytheistic beliefs and practices by quoting from the Quran, but in the 'Hindi' language, so that those who did not know Arabic could escape *shirk* (Ali 1822: 2). Qurban Ali's *Tōhfat ul Mōminīn* is yet another book in the same general category. However, along with being a Shariah guidebook, it also attributes miraculous powers and body processes to the Prophet of Islam like folk literature of the Barelvi kind (Ali n.d.).

The simple Shariah guidebooks confine themselves to correcting religious practices. For instance the *Shariat kā Lath* was one such guidebook (Khaliq 1290/1873). It is especially meant to admonish those who do not say their prayers and the words '*risālā bē namāzgān*' and '*nasīhat nāmā*' are part of the title. Another such book, this time by an anonymous author, explains rituals of religion in Urdu verse. For instance this book says about performing ablution prior to worship.

> *Farz ghusal mẽ tīn sanbhāl*
> *Paēhlē mŭ mē pānī dāl*
> (In bathing there are three mandatory practices first put water in the mouth).

The manuscript of this book consists of only three pages pasted in another work (Anonymous *c*. 18th century). Other such examples are *Rāh-ē-jannat*, *Masāil-ē-Hindi* (Anonymous 1233/1818).

A related genre was the description of the 'day of judgment'. Shah Rafiuddin's Persian pamphlet *Qiāmat Nāmā* [Account of the Day of Judgment], a work of this kind, was translated by Syed Abdullah Ibn Bahadur Ali into 'rekhta *Hindi*' (i.e. Urdu) as *Dāb ul Ākhirat* (Abdullah 1239/1863).[4]

These works were printed several times and some remain in print even now. Indeed, they were found so useful for the shaping of the pious personality that they were recommended even to women.[5] However, as such printed material spread it sharpened and articulated sectarian and sub-sectarian identities. In this context it is useful to turn to the development of these identities during this period.

THE AHL-I-HADITH

The Ahl-i-Hadith, in common with many eighteenth century Muslim thinkers inspired by Shah Waliullah, wanted to reform Indian Islam. This was their response to the political weakness of the Muslims in India. The Ahl-i-Hadith, moreover, were also inspired by Abdul Wahab (1703–1792) of Saudi Arabia, who was completely antagonistic to the veneration of the tombs of saints and Sufism as it flourished in his day. The Ahl-i-Hadith, or Wahhabis as they were called in India, wrote learned treatises in Persian but they also understood the value of spreading their message in Urdu and other languages, especially Bengali, to the laity. These tracts have been described in many works and Churchill gives a succinct summary of the important ones (Churchill 1975: 276–281). This section introduces some of the more prominent writers and their works. Wilayat Ali (b. 1790), one of their leaders in Patna, taught the rudiments of the faith in simple Urdu. He got the translation of the Quran by Shah Abdul Qadir, as well as some writings of Shah Ismail in Urdu printed locally and 'distributed among the members of the gatherings, which included some women also' (Ahmad 1966: 84). Another Ahl-i-Hadith thinker, Haji Badruddin, wrote his *fatwā* in

Bengali verse which, of course, must have appealed to ordinary people (Ahmad 1966: 237).

As the Wahhabis fought the British as well as the Sikhs in the present-day Khyber Pakhtunkhwa they emphasized jihad [religious war or *Bellum Justum*]. Some of their tracts praised the concept of the 'just war'. These tracts were in Urdu and were easily accessible to the public. The British were well aware of the 'Rebel camp on the Punjab Frontier' as W.W. Hunter calls it. It was established in 1831 and finally defeated in 1868 (Hunter 1871: 3). The main leader of the fighters, Sayyid Ahmad, preached from 1820 to 1822 and Hunter reports that a number of Urdu poems foretelling the downfall of the British were in circulation (Hunter 1871: 51–54). The itinerant Wahhabi preacher whom Hunter describes must also have preached in the same language (Ibid., 59). The Ahl-i-Hadith created prose literature in Urdu which has been described as follows:

> Addressed mainly to the common people the manner of presentation is geared to their mental level. The narrative is simple and conversational. It is in sharp contrast to the ornamental rhymed prose then generally in use. Arguments are backed with quotations from the *Qur'ān* and *Hadīth*, translated in Urdu. Didactic stories and similes are used to illustrate the points (Ahmad 1966: 282).

Thus, at least by 1820, as the *Awadh Akhbār* of 15 January 1870 noted, 'religious works of fifty years are now all being compiled in Urdu'. However, as Marc Gaborieau has pointed out in his well-researched study on this subject, most Wahhabi writings (as well as those of other sects, one might add) were in Persian. It was only after 1857 that 'the ratio of Persian to Urdu is reversed' (1995: 172). However, the fact that there were Urdu writings at all from the early nineteenth century onwards suggests that Urdu was considered by the Wahhabi preachers as having the potential to advance their cause. It might be added that the period of lofty Urdu poetry, at least in North India, is

generally dated to Vali Dakani (d. 1707) whose poetry stands at the beginning of the classical age of the Urdu ghazal. The implication is that this high literary pedestal owed its existence to the widespread use of Urdu in other domains such as the dissemination of religious ideas.

The Deobandis

The Deobandi interpretation of Islam, which is strict and puritanical, goes against the saint-ridden, folk Islam of ordinary Indian Muslims. Its literature in Urdu is described in brief outline by Churchill (1975: 283–286). Because of numerous pamphlets and monographs against the saint-ridden folk Islam, popular among common people as well as the Sharia'h guide books, the Deobandi version of Islam spread among urban, educated Muslims. It also gained momentum as the graduates of Deoband occupied mosques and the *Bahishtī Zēvar* [The Jewellery of Paradise] of Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (d. 1943), a detailed and comprehensive Sharia'h guidebook primarily meant for women, became a household name in North India and the areas now in Pakistan.

In Pakistan the Deobandi madrassas increased from 1,779 in 1988 to nearly 7,000 in 2002 (GOP 1988; Rahman 2004: 190–191) and are now reported to be more than 12,000 (GOP 2006: 23). They are also ones that are associated with militant and extremist Islam since the Taliban, who imposed a very stringent version of the Sharia'h on Afghanistan (Rashid 2000), were students of these madrassas. They are concentrated in KP and Balochistan which are also associated with Islamic radicalism. The language of the Deobandis, even in KP where the mother-tongue of most students is Pashto, remains Urdu. It is also the language of examination of these madrassas as well as the language of the preachers in mosques, of pamphlets meant to refute other sects and for carrying out administrative functions of the Deobandi seminaries,

In short, Urdu is the main language for the dissemination of the Deobandi ideology in South Asia.

THE BARELVIS

The Barelvis—or Ahl-i-Sunnat as they call themselves—are inspired by the work of Ahmed Raza Khan (1856–1921). Ahmed Raza, belonging to an *ashrāf* family of Pathan origin from Bareilly, belonged to the Urdu culture of UP. He founded a madrassa called Manzar al-Islam. By this time Urdu was the established language of Islam in India, therefore, the Barelvis used it in their sermons, popular poetry and the theological debates with their rivals, the Deobandis and the Ahl-i-Hadith. They also had two major presses in Bareilly, the Hasani Press and the Matba' Ahl-i-Sunnat wal Jama'at. They published almost all the *fatāwās* of Ahmed Raza Khan (Sanyal 1996: 83). Besides, there is a large number of *Nūr Nāmās*, and not only in Urdu but in all major languages of South Asian Muslims, on this theme. Barelvi Islam, affirming the intercession of saints, is the folk Islam of South Asia and fulfils the spiritual needs of the people. Its tenets and interpretation of Islamic law have been spread widely by an Urdu work, Amjad 'Ali Azami's *Bahār-ē-Shari'at*, [The Spring of the Islamic Canonical Law] (n.d.) which is the equivalent of the Deobandi work *Bahishtī Zēvar*.

OTHER SCHOOLS OF ISLAMIC THOUGHT

In Lucknow the Farangi Maehli family of religious scholars had been teaching Islamic studies since the eighteenth century. Mulla Nizamaddin, the inventor of the curriculum called the *Dars-i-Nizāmī*, was a speaker of Urdu (Robinson 2002: 46–52). In 1905 Maulana Abdul Bari created the '*Madrassa-i Āliyā Nizāmiyyā* which continued its work until the 1960s (Robinson 2002: 71). 'A course of books was taught in Urdu' in this Cambridge of India to those who did not undertake the study of the full *Dars-i-Nizāmī* (Ibid.,

126). The Farangi Maehli family of alims had 'produced some of the earliest Urdu newspapers which still exist, *Tilism-i-Lakhnaw*, which appeared in the year before the Mutiny uprising, and *Kārnāmā*, which appeared in the three decades after it' (Ibid., 133).

URDU AS THE LANGUAGE OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Maulana Qasim Nanautvi (1833–1877), the pioneer of the Islamic seminary at Deoband, mentions with approval that the Delhi College was using Urdu as the medium of instruction instead of Persian (Gilani Vol. 1, 1954: 100). The famous madrassa he and Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (1829–1905) established at Deoband in 1867, which pioneered the Deobandi movement, used Urdu as a medium of instruction (for description of the beginnings see Azhar 1985; Metcalf 1982). Thus, as Barbara Metcalf has pointed out, it 'was instrumental in establishing Urdu as a language of communication among the Muslims of India' (Metcalf 1982: 102–103). At Deoband, translations from Arabic to Urdu and vice versa, were part of the curriculum (Azhar 1985: 90). There were also classes of Urdu (Ibid., 92). Urdu was also taught in the basic *maktabs* where the Quran was taught in Arabic without understanding. Besides the usual primers, the letters of Ghalib, being paradigmatic samples of simple and powerful Urdu writing, were also taught. Besides, Urdu educational literature, especially created through British agency for ordinary schools, was also used in the madrassas. These included 'the poems of Zauq and Ghalib, and for women Nazir Ahmad's *Mirāt-ul-Urūs* and *Taubat-un-Nusūh*' (Churchill 1975: 273). Books on ethical instruction, equally valid for all religious communities, such as the ubiquitous *Dharam Singh kā Qissā*, a didactic tale of learning to avoid common follies and ignorance and pass a fruitful life, were also taught. The major effect of this transition from Persian to Urdu was that more people could internalize the arguments and information which was otherwise only memorized. Also, formal education creates a veritable

industry of guides for students, exegeses, translations and summaries. These became widely available in due course thus bringing far more people in contact with religious ideas of some kind than it was possible to do so in the age when Urdu was not the medium of instruction in the Islamic seminaries.

URDU AS THE LANGUAGE OF DEBATE IN INDIAN ISLAM

So common was the use of Urdu as a religious language that sects considered heretical—such as the Ahmedis (or Qadianis)—also used it for writing and missionary work. Although Mirza Ghulam Ahmed (1835?–1908) wrote in Arabic and Persian for authenticity, he also wrote extensively in Urdu to disseminate his message among the masses (Friedman 1989: 135). He published 'at least 60 works in Urdu most of which appeared before 1900. Indeed, Urdu appears to have been the major language of the Ahmadis' (Churchill 1975: 292). He even claimed that 'he received his revelations in Urdu more than Arabic' (Ibid., 293). His spiritual successors also continued to write in Urdu.

Another sect, considered heretical by mainstream ulema, the Ahl-i-Quran, argued that the hadis is not reliable, therefore, guidance can only be obtained from the Quran. Ghulam Ahmed Parvez (b. 1903), the most well-known proponent of the sect in the twentieth century, wrote extensively in Urdu. He began with writing in the *Tarjumānu'l-Quran*, the mouthpiece of the Jamā'at-i Islāmī but developed heterodox ideas which Khurshid Ahmad describes as socialistic (Ahmad 1972: 320–328). He even argued that prayers can be said in Urdu instead of Arabic (Mustafa 1990: 241).

Urdu is also the language of Islamic revivalism. Sayyid Abu'l A'la Maududi (1903–1979), the pioneer of revivalist Islam, through the efforts of his Jamā'at-i Islāmī, wrote his entire work in idiomatic and accessible Urdu (Ahmad 1972: 328–348). He was himself from Delhi and spoke idiomatic Urdu at home (Nasr

1994: 3). He is a pioneer in using easily comprehensible Urdu
rather than the Arabic-laden jargon of maulvis which was used
by writers on religious subjects earlier. He is also an Urdu
journalist whose journal *Tarjumānu'l-Quran* appealed to the
middle class of the urban areas of North India and Pakistan.
Maududi's books were read by middle class professionals in
Pakistan who have a tremendous influence in the Jamā'at-i.
These people supported Urdu in Pakistan against all other
languages.

All the debates of the Pakistani and the Indian ulema in the
last century and at present are in Urdu. Their writings, refuting
each other's beliefs, are in the same language. The first important
movement of a religious kind in Urdu was for the refutation of
Christianity. This is described by Powell (1993) and Moinuddin
Aqil both before 1857 and after it (Aqil 2008: 143–148 and 216–
221). The first book of this type (i.e. refutation of non-Islamic
beliefs) in Urdu is said to be a response by Ikram Uddin
Shahjahanpuri to a priest's answers to questions about religious
beliefs. This was written in 1245/1829–30. However, the first
printed book for the refutation of Christianity in Urdu is Abbas
Ali's book, entitled in Arabic, <u>Khi</u>lāsa Saulat ul Zai<u>gh</u>am 'Ali A' da'
Ibn-ē-Maryam (1248/1832–33) (Aqil 2008: 146). The missionaries
initially wrote in Persian but then shifted to Urdu so that the
tract *Dīn-e Haq kī Taēhqīq* (1842) by William Smith (d. 1859) and
Charles Leupolt (d. 1884) were in Urdu. Carl Gottlieb Pfander
(d. 1868) who argued with the ulema between 1844 and 1847 at
Agra used Urdu. Among the most famous of the ulema who
refuted Christianity is Rahmat Ullah Kairanvi (1818–1891), whose
debate (*munāzarā*) at Agra with Pfander is well-known as a great
success among Islamic circles in South Asia. His refutation of
Christianity in six volumes appeared in Arabic in 1864. It was
soon translated into Urdu and is now available in English
translation as *Izhār al-Haq: The Truth Revealed* (2003) (Izhar 2010).
Even newspapers, such as the *Manshūr-ē-Muhammadī* from

Bangalore took upon themselves the duty of refuting Christianity (Aqil 2008: 501).

And it was not only Christianity which was refuted in Urdu. Indeed, almost all of the literature refuting heretical or alien beliefs as well as the beliefs of other sects and sub-sects is in Urdu (Rahman 2008b: 204–220). For instance, the criticism of Maududi and its reply is in Urdu (Yusuf 1968); all religious arguments are in the same language (Ludhianwi 1995) and so are all the writings of the ulema whether against Western philosophies (Usmani 1997) or other matters. These texts, called *munāzarā* texts by the present author, are widely distributed in Pakistan and India. They are not necessarily prescribed in the madrassas, at least not in the printed syllabi any more though they used to be earlier, but they are constantly reprinted which suggests that they are read. These texts are polemical in tone and use the disputation skills honed to effect in the madrassas where the art of refuting the doctrinal position of other sects, sub-sects and heretical or alien ideologies is taught. As the texts are in Urdu their arguments are internalized whereas the traditional textbooks of the Dars-i-Nizami are in Arabic and are learned by heart but not internalized as these Urdu texts are (Rahman 2008 b).

In addition to the texts, there are also the 'Jihadi' or militant texts. These are pamphlets, magazines and tracts which argue that the leadership in Muslim countries, including Pakistan, has sold itself to the West; that there is an international Zionist-Christian-Hindu conspiracy against Muslims; and that the appropriate response to this is armed struggle (jihad). Some of these discourses also justify suicide bombing as part of asymmetrical warfare. These texts circulate in Pakistan in mosques, madrassas, bus stops etc and are mostly in Urdu though some are in Pashto also (PIPS 2010).

URDU IN RELIGIOUS POETRY
AND REFORMIST FICTION

Besides the use of Urdu in the domains mentioned above, one may not forget the considerable influence of religious poetry in Urdu. There was, for instance, an upsurge of the *nā'at* (poetry in praise of the Prophet of Islam) during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as the Barelvi sub-sect popularized the celebration of the Eid Milad un Nabi (birthday of the Prophet). The *nā'at* poetry was read out in these functions and it was always a prefatory part of all stories in verse. A large number of poets who have such verse to their credit have been mentioned by Khan (1985: 114–137). Ahmad Raza Khan, the ideologue of the Barelvi sub-sect who has been mentioned earlier, himself wrote poetry of this genre which are in the lofty tradition of Urdu poetry of his times (see example in Sanyal 1996: 146–148). The main text of the Barelvi *maslak* is devotion to the Prophet of Islam and many of the verses are about this subject (Ibid., 155–158). He also celebrated the *Mīlād* with much enthusiasm described by his biographer Usha Sanyal (1996: 159–160).

Elegies (*marsiyās*) about the martyrdom of Imam Hussain in the Battle of Karbala were also popular among South Asian Muslims, especially the Shias. Indeed, they became an important part of the oral and written culture of both the Shia kingdoms of the Deccan and the kingdom of Oudh. And not only the Shias but also the Sunnis read and narrated *marsiyās* all over North India and present-day Pakistan. Such elegies were written in Urdu by poets such as Hashmi Bijapuri (1656–1672), Mulla Vajhi, etc., in the Deccan (Shareef 2004: 767; Siddiqui 1967: 716–717). Later, in Lucknow, Mir Anees (d. 1874) and Mirza Dabeer (d. 1875) became famous *marsiyā* poets whose Urdu verses were part of the mourning for the martyrs of Karbala in Muharram (Siddiqui 1967: 721–792). In Lucknow, for instance, Minister Agha Mir patronized the writing of religious poetry especially *marsiyās* (Ansarullah 1988: 78). The *marsiyā* became such a cultural trend

that even Hindus wrote them. Akbar Haider Kashmiri has compiled the work of some such poets in a book entitled *Hindū Marsiyā Gō Shu 'arā* (Kashmiri 2004).

Reformist literature in Urdu—such as the work of Nazir Ahmad—which will be mentioned in more detail in the chapter on education (11) also helped spread the idea that adherence to Islam—the 'high church' rather than the 'low church' version (Gellner 1983: 74)—would counteract social evils. A good example of this is Rasheed un Nisa's novel *Islāh un Nisā*, which contrasts two kinds of marriages: the *shara'ī* and the *'urfī*. The former is simple, dignified, inexpensive, and as the name implies, in consonance with Islamic law. The latter is full of irrational traditions, highly extravagant, and against Islamic injunctions as dancing and consulting astrologers (Muslim and Hindu ones) are involved. The message is that reform involves Islamization of lifestyle and abandonment of the syncretic practices of folk Islam. Songs with names of Hindu historical and religious personalities (Ram, Lachman) are especially objected to (Nisa 1894: 86) and a hardened, religiously inspired Muslim identity is constructed. The contemporary equivalent of such a movement is the Al-Huda movement pioneered by Farhat Hashmi in Pakistan which teaches the Quran and the practice of Islam in one's personal life to women in Urdu and, to a lesser extent, in English rather than Arabic (Ahmad 2009: 42). Thus, the movements for societal reform also function as movements for Islamization of the self through the medium of Urdu.

URDU IN MODERN SUFI WRITING

From the first half of the nineteenth century Urdu came to replace Persian in the Sufi tradition also. Writing on the Sufis of the Deccan Nile Green tells us:

> It was mainly the development of this tradition of Urdu *tadhkirāt* that provided the means by which the memory of the saints was passed

on to modern times after the collapse of literary participation in Persian. Sufi biographical writings formed part of this growth of Urdu prose writing and Awrangabad also saw the composition of Sufi texts in Urdu by residents of the city attached to the new Sufi tradition of Banē Miyān, as well as the featuring of its older Mughal saints in new Urdu Sufi biographical texts written elsewhere in the Deccan (Green 2006: 124).

A *Tazkarā* in Urdu which has gained wide circulation and is still being reprinted is the *Tazkarā-ē-Ghausiā*, which is the hagiography of Syed Ghaus Ali Shah (1219/1804—1297/1880), written by Gul Hasan Shah in 1301/1884 (see Shah 1884). The nineteenth century was the time for a renaissance of Indian Islam and, thanks to the printing press, the large number of publications coming out in the form of books, pamphlets, magazines, and newspapers disseminated Islamic thought in Urdu. In this context the role of the Darul Musannifin, a major publisher and disseminator of Islamic literature, is important (for Shibli and Sulaiman Nadvi's contribution to it see Nadvi 1986: 95–140). Khurshid Ahmad, while writing on Islamic literature in Urdu, mentions the pioneering role of Shibli, Sulaiman Nadvi, Abul Kalam Azad (1888–1958), Ashraf Ali Thanvi, Mohammad Iqbal, Inayatuyllah Khan Mashriqi (1888–1960), Ghulam Ahmed Parvez, and Maulana Maududi, who have been mentioned already in the dissemination of Islamic writings (Ahmad 1972: 261–338). All of these famous intellectuals wrote in the shadow of the empire and their major concern was to reconcile Islam with the seemingly overwhelming dominance of the West and to give faith to Muslims that Islam had a meaningful philosophy to offer to them in order not to be inundated by Western and specifically Christian thought. They wrote on all Islamic issues but in a modern perspective and also on political, educational and social matters.

Thus Urdu came to possess the highest number of Islamic writings among all the languages in South Asia. It had translations

and exegeses of the Quran (Khan 1987: 18; Naqvi 1992); Islamic textbooks associated with teaching in the madrassas; the highest number of elegies commemorating the martyrdom of Hussain; the writings of revivalists and Islamic pressure groups in Pakistan and India and several other sub-genres of religious writings. Thus, texts supporting and nourishing all kinds of Islamic traditions in South Asia—the orthodox, the Sufi, the modernist, the revivalist and even those considered heretical— were increasingly available in Urdu rather than only in Persian and Arabic during British rule in India. In short, Urdu became the oral and written language of Islam in South Asia during the modern age (for a list of books on religious themes in Urdu see Khan 1985: 76–173). Let us now come to the implications of these facts for Pakistan.

URDU, MUSLIM IDENTITY AND PAKISTAN

Islam and Urdu both contributed to the creation of Pakistan, a state for the Muslims of British India, in 1947. Islam was the principal identity symbol of the Indian Muslims who got mobilized to give a united opposition to the Hindu majority to obtain maximum political and economic advantages and then, under the leadership of Mohammad Ali Jinnah (1876–1948), partitioned India to create Pakistan and Bharat (India). In this context the works of Shibli Nomani, Altaf Husain Hali, and Iqbal played a great role. Shibli's books on the biographies of Imam Abu Hanifa, *Sīrat un No'mān*, and that of Omar Farooq, *Al-Fārūq*, have been called extensions of the Hanafi-and Ahl-e-Hadith debate and the Shia-Sunni debate respectively. Nevertheless, they played a great role in making Urdu the language of Islamic themes which were read by a large number of the Urdu-reading public (Ikram 1971: 455). Hali's long poems such as '*Mad-ō-jazr-ē-Islām*' (1879) appealed to Indian Muslims and were recited all over India. Similarly Iqbal's '*Shikwā*' and '*Jawāb-ē-Shikwā*' also reinforced the Indian Muslims' sense of nostalgia for past glory

and prescribed a return to Islam as a solution for all problems. Urdu, which had become a symbol of Muslim identity during the nineteenth century, also became the subsidiary symbol of the Indian Muslim identity which helped establish the new state.

Both Urdu and Islam came to play different, and even opposing, roles in the power dynamics of post-partition Muslim communities in Pakistan and North India. In Pakistan, the ruling elite, which was mostly Punjabi-speaking, continued to consolidate its dominance over the different ethnicities comprising Pakistan, in the name of Islam and Urdu. Even literary figures were divided along ideological lines which led to the creation of a movement for Islamic literature in Urdu as described by Anwar Sadeed, among others (Sadeed 1985: 600–610). Thus Ghulam Mustafa Khan, writing during Ziaul Haq's rule, praises the military ruler's encouragement of Islamic themes in Urdu literature while running down the literature of the Progressive Movement for its alleged promotion of nudity, atheism and socialism (Khan 1985: 254–266). The Islamic movement opposed both the left-leaning Progressive Movement as well as the politically centrist modernist movement because both were perceived to support Western sexually permissive mores. The movement was inspired by Maududi and his view of creating Islamic minds in order to create an Islamic state. The movement was opposed not only to Western ideologies (socialism and liberalism) but also to ethnic, identity-based politics in Pakistan.

In East Pakistan the Bengali ethnicity, mobilized initially by the identity symbol of the Bengali language, created Bangladesh in 1971 (Umar 2004: 190–229). In West Pakistan, the Sindhis, Baloch, Pashtuns, and Siraikis have all used their respective languages as ethnic identity symbols to procure power and a more equitable distribution of power and resources in the state (Rahman 1996). Thus in Pakistan, Urdu came to be associated with the ruling elite as far as its domination over the weaker

ethnic groups was concerned. The strongest religious influence on the educated, urban lower-middle and middle-classes is that of the Jamā'at-i Islāmī, who were strong supporters of Urdu. According to Seyyed Vali Nasr:

> The party [Jamā'at]... much like the Muslim League had viewed Urdu as the linchpin of the two-nation theory and a cornerstone of Pakistani nationalism. Allegiance to Urdu was therefore an article of faith in the Jama'at. The rural and urban poor are as deeply rooted in vernaculars such as Baluchi, Pakhtun, Punjabi, Siraiki, and Sindhi. Outside of the Muhajir communities of Sind, Urdu is not used below the lower-middle class (Nasr 1994: 85).

To add to Nasr's argument, the Jamā'at considered Urdu as part of its cultural agenda of resisting both Westernization through English and the weakening of the nation-state through ethnic nationalism based on language identity.

Because of the religious right's support of Urdu, both the ethno-nationalists, using the identity symbols of the indigenous languages of the people, as well as the Westernized, English-speaking elite, oppose Urdu. The latter feel that this language would empower the religious lobby which, in their view, would suppress women and probably inhibit creativity, arts and research. Hence Khalid Ahmed, a well-known liberal intellectual from Lahore, argues that Urdu is intrinsically not a progressive language while English is (Ahmed 1998). Other Westernized people oppose Urdu both in the domains of education and in the media because it threatens to undermine their own elitist status.

While in Pakistan, Urdu is often associated with pro-establishment and right-wing forces; in India it is anti-establishment and generally stands for the autonomy, identity and rights of the Muslim community. Though spoken only in parts of North India, and that too in the urban areas, it is a symbol of the Muslim identity for most Indian Muslims. However,

the third generation of Muslims in ghettoized areas like Old Delhi, as mentioned earlier, are moving away from Urdu, which indexes a lower-class, uneducated Muslim identity for them (Ahmad 2007: 148–150). At the upper political level, however, Muslims feel that the fight to preserve Urdu is part of keeping India a pluralistic democracy (Farouqui 2006). Apart from writings by scholars and Muslim politicians in India, the clergy regards Urdu as a language of Muslims even though some exceptional non-Muslims, like J.S. Gandhi, who heard a Mullah pontificating to that effect in 1996, felt that Urdu is not the property of Muslims (Gandhi 2002: 139). In India, in fact, the madrassas are seen as repositories of skills pertaining to the Urdu script which is not generally taught in the secular stream of education (Winkelmann 2006: 259). Even in Vellore, South India, where the mother-tongue is Tamil, the madrassas offer Urdu as well as Tamil as a medium of instruction for the first four years in the madrassa (Tschacher 2006: 206). The Urdu script has penetrated the Tamil-speaking world so much that the children, while reading Arwi texts—which are in Tamil written in the Arabic script—use 'the Persian-based Urdu alphabet' and get confused especially while producing the 'p' as this 'is written in an entirely different way in the two scripts' (Tschacher 2001: 64). Indeed, a new identity is being indexed with Urdu in India: that of the Islamic clergyman. Urdu is often called the '*Maulana kī Zubān*' (the language of the Muslim clergyman) in India. They are the preservers of the distinctive phonemes of Urdu as well as the Perso-Arabic diction which distinguishes its high variety from Hindi (Ahmad 2007: 208). In pre-partition Bengal, according to S.K. Chatterji, Urdu was called "'*Nabī-jī-kā-Bhā sā*" or "the Holy Prophet's speech"' (Chatterji 1942: 162) and this association with Islam continues even now. In Bangladesh, though created on the basis of Bengali-based ethno-nationalism, Urdu is still used in the madrassas.

There are two kinds of madrassas in Bangladesh, the *Qaōmī* (spelled Quomi in the original source) and the 'Āliyā (Anzar 2003). The former are entirely private while the latter, though mostly private, are financially supported to a large extent by the government. In one of them, the Jami'a Islamia Yunusia, was formed by an Urdu-speaking cleric from UP and the curriculum is still printed in Urdu (Kabir, H. 2009: 426). In another such madrassa, this time for girls 'the teaching is in Urdu and Arabic' (Mannan and Mannan 2010). If it is true that the number of madrassas has grown by 27.9 per cent vis a vis other educational institutions which have grown 16 per cent, and there are around 10,000 quomi madrassas and 20 per cent students get educated in both types of madrassas (Ibid., 2010), then Urdu certainly has a niche in the religious education sector of Bangladesh. The point is not whether Urdu is well-taught or whether the average student in a madrassa is proficient in the language. The point is that Urdu is associated with Islam in Bangladesh as it is in India and Pakistan.

Because of this link, a number of Muslim clerics learnt Urdu and read Islamic literature in that language. It remains associated with Islam in the minds of those who see themselves as members of a South Asian Islamic community. Thus Farhad Mazhar, a writer of Urdu in Bangladesh, told Pakistani writer Asif Farrukhi in 1988 that 'Urdu should be reclaimed as an integral part of the subcontinent's Islamic culture' (Farrukhi 1989: 86). In short, the madrassa network in South Asia is the biggest supporter of Urdu. And, while doing so it necessarily associates the language with Islam.

THE POLITICAL USES OF LANGUAGE PLANNING OF URDU IN PAKISTAN

In Pakistan, the ruling elite, which is predominantly Punjabi, has used Urdu next only to Islam itself as a means of creating national unity which should transcend ethnic division. The major

fear driving this policy of using Urdu as the symbol of Islam is to confront the Indian 'other' from which Pakistan separated and which is still feared as it would absorb Pakistan unless Pakistan kept emphasizing the difference between Hindus and Muslims, the major one being religion itself.

Since the state used Urdu as a symbol of Islamic identity, its language planning activities revolved around it. One instance of legitimizing West Pakistani domination of East Pakistan was the Islamization of Bengali. The central government established adult education centres to teach Bengali through the Arabic Script' (PO, 4 Oct 1950). The Language Committee set up in 1950 recommended non-Sanskritized Bengali and the teaching of Urdu (LAD-B, 31 Oct 1951: 25). At this period, because Bengali ethnic identity was expressed through the Bengali language, Urdu was seen as an imposition by the West Pakistani elite.

Another area in which the Islamic identity was associated with Urdu and its script was neologism—the coining of new terms to express modern concepts in the languages of Pakistan. The Urdu script was considered the desiderated script for languages without an old established script such as Punjabi, Siraiki, Balochi, Brahvi and, of course, the unwritten languages of the country. In Balochistan, the convention on the Balochi script, held in September 1972, became a battle ground between the left-leaning ethno-nationalists and the right-leaning Pakistani nationalists. The former rejected the Urdu script even preferring the Roman one to it while the latter insisted upon it (Rahman 1996: 166).

In short, Urdu and Islam are used to subordinate the ethnic elites in favour of the Punjabi elite in Pakistan but, ironically enough, both are in fact subordinated to the interests of the Westernized, English-using, urban elite. The political uses of Urdu as a part of the Islamic and Pakistani nationalist identity are, therefore, complex and contradictory.

It may be said, therefore, that Urdu, which is strongly linked with the Pakistani Islamic identity, is also used to construct and reinforce the Islamic identity in the rest of South Asia.

NOTES

1. اوہنوسہ ماڈّیہ کھن شراما کر ہوا

   While some words are given in the glossary the meaning of this line is not clear to this author.

2. The copy consulted had the following title in English besides the words *Qur'an Majīd* 1285/1868–69 in Urdu. *Kurán with Persian Interlinear and Two Hindustani Versions* (OIOC).

3. The book was written in Persian and translated by the author in Urdu. However, since he died the second chapter was translated by Mohammad Sultan Khan who called it the *Taqwiat ul Īmān* and published it in 1876.

4. The author's name is missing on the manuscript in the OIOC but there is a note saying that it has been translated from the Persian work of Shah Rafiuddin.

5. Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi includes a number of the books mentioned here as being 'useful' for women in his *Bahishtī Zēvar* such as: the translation of Shah Rafi Uddin's *Qiāmat Nāmā* in Urdu; *Shari'at kā laṭh*; *Tambīh ul Ghāfilīn*; *Nasīhat Nāmā* etc (Thanvi n.d. part–10: 60–61)

7

Urdu as the Language of Love

While the association of Urdu with Islam is still strong it is often forgotten that, paradoxically enough, the language was also associated with love—the amorous and erotic aspects of life. This second association was suppressed by reformers and the one with Islam has won out, but it was a constant refrain in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and should be given the attention it deserves in this study. This chapter, therefore, traces out how Urdu developed the reputation of being the language of love—something which its critics call it sometimes even now—during the heyday of classical Urdu poetry. Let us then begin with such a critic.

Haris Chandra Bharatendu (1849–1882), the father of modern Hindi literature (Dalmia 1997), said in his statement before the Hunter Commission (1882):

> There is a secret motive which induces the worshippers of Urdu to devote themselves to its cause. It is the language of dancing-girls and prostitutes. The depraved sons of wealthy Hindus and youths of substance and loose character, when in society of harlots, concubines, and pimps, speak Urdu, as it is the language of their mistresses and beloved ones. The correct pronunciation of Urdu, with its s*hin*, *ghain*, and guttural *kaf*, is indispensable, and one unable to twist his tongue into unnatural and unpleasant distortions is not a welcome or an agreeable companion (Edn. Com. NWP 1884: 201).

Another respondent, Siva Prashad, said that 'some of the women take up also amorous and vicious books, such as Mir Hasan ki

Masnavi, Indarsabha, etc. etc' (Ibid., 323). Even books in Urdu translation, such as the *Alif Lailā* and *Qissā Tōtā Mainā*, were blamed for creating mistrust for women and obsession with sex. Thus in Upendranath Ashk's (1910–1996) short story '*Chētan kī Mā*', Pandit Shadi Ram locks his wife in the house when he goes out because of his reading of these works. Both the respondents were supporters of Hindi against Urdu while the Hindi-Urdu controversy was going on during this period. Could it be that the association of Urdu with love and eroticism, which they had brought up, was merely an allegation? A stratagem to defeat the pro-Urdu lobby? An anti-Urdu (and possibly anti-Muslim?) prejudice? Or, could it be that Urdu really did have such associations in the minds of many members of the intelligentsia? And, if so, why is there so much silence about them among Pakistani and Indian Muslims nowadays? Does this silence itself indicate certain ideological and political imperatives which can be understood once the erotic and amorous themes are documented?

These are some of the questions which this chapter will attempt to answer. It is not claimed that this is an original discovery. The claims made here are much more modest. First, to bring together the vast and scattered references to the amorous and the erotic known only to scholars of Urdu, and more importantly, to bring out into the open what has deliberately been blotted out of the collective memory of users of Urdu in South Asia which, I believe, is necessary in a social and political history of Urdu.

This association with the amorous and the erotic was primarily with Urdu poetry, but since the language was taught through literature, it was extended to the language itself. The reformers of Muslim society, aware of this nexus, tried to break it and to strengthen the association with Islam which was also formed roughly during the same period as we have seen in the previous chapter. As the educated gentry (*ashrāf*) studied Persian texts till

the middle of the nineteenth century, the British officials and the Muslim reformers made deliberate attempts to purge the curricula of them (Rahman 2002: 499–509; Stark 2008: 93–100). The erotic and the amorous was associated with moral degeneration and decadence, and was blamed for the backwardness and the political defeat of the Muslim ruling elite. For the ulema it was not only associated with all these things, but was also a great sin. Thus, in order to regenerate a powerful Muslim 'nation' (*qaōm*), a new literature, chaste and moral, had to be created. The moral and political imperative and the steps taken to bring the amorous and erotic themes in Urdu literature in disrepute, and create a culture shame and silence about them, persist to this day. Thus, the textbook committees in Pakistan exclude love poetry, even from the masters of the ghazal, out of the Urdu curricula. In India, too, there is the same shamefacedness and reluctance to teach about love and the night of the union (*Shab-ē-visāl*) in the classroom (Qidvai 1987: 21). And that is why Pakistani Television is squeamish about a married couple holding hands on the screen.

The erotic is excluded to such an extent from the officially constructed identities of Muslims that the classics of Persian and Arabic, which are proudly owned as being Muslim heritage languages, are not read in unexpurgated editions, at least in Pakistani universities and perhaps in Indian ones too. Hardly any scholar touches the erotic as a subject of serious research, although writings on the subject become popular among that group of the intelligentsia of Urdu letters which can only be described as the equivalent of 'the Other Victorians'. For instance, Zamir Uddin Ahmad's study of the sexuality of the beloved (Ahmad 1990) created a sensation and has had several reprints. Works of scholarship on such themes have been published by South Asians living, or at least publishing, in the West (notably Vanita and Kidwai 2000) but those published in Pakistan and India—a study of sexuality in the Urdu short story

(Khan 2002) and boy-love in Urdu poetry (Azhar 1995) for example—are superficial and lack analysis. This is hardly surprising considering that in Pakistan the construction of the Muslim identity suppresses the erotic, associating it with the decadent 'West' or the sensational nudity of Bollywood. And in India it is a theme which does not bear placing in a serious context, either in Muslim politics or in the Hindutva one for both of which it is a stigma to be shunned. In short, the reformist discourse excludes the erotic and amorous for ideological and political reasons.

Such exclusion began in the nineteenth century and some of the reformist themes of the literature produced in Urdu during this period bear closer re-examination because they tell us what kind of associations existed in the minds of the educated public about Urdu poetry.

REFORMIST URDU LITERATURE
ON THE EROTIC THEME

The Victorian British, in their puritanical zeal, professed to be scandalized by the expression of sexuality in both Muslim and Hindu classics. As the Muslim classics were part of the curricula, which they also studied when they learned Persian, they began to condemn it unequivocally (Rahman 2002: 503–508; Stark 2008: 90–95) For instance, although the *vāsōkht* never has obscene words, Matthew Kempson, appointed Director of Public Instruction of the North Western Provinces in 1861, condemned it as 'trash'. Indeed, he went ahead to condemn the fact that Urdu 'which we take pains in utilizing as an organ of education in the masses, should thus become a vehicle of immorality.' (Stark 2008: 93). In this crusade against erotic literature, which has been touched upon synoptically as far as the British are concerned because it has been dealt with in detail earlier by other researchers, the Indian reformers also joined in. Let us now refer to the work of some prominent Muslim literary figures who

brought about the consciousness of the need for reform in
Urdu

Mohammad Hussain Azad expresses this consciousness about
Urdu's association with the erotic in his *Āb-ē-Hayāt*, when he
complains that people agree to stigmatise Urdu as a language
which can only express amorous subjects and not others. For him
this is a great blot on the reputation of 'our national language'
(*hamārī qaōmī zubān*) (Azad *c.* 19th century: 73). Nazir Ahmed's
novel *Fasānā-ē-Muttilā* (1887) begins with the following reflections
regarding Urdu poetry:

> What is there in our poetry except love affairs (*ishq bāzī*) and lack of
> manners (*bē taēhzībī*). Boys of respectable (*sharīf*) families learn
> habits leading to corruption from this very school....(Ahmed 2004:
> 621).

The protagonist, Muttila, was taught Persian because it was
assumed that one could not learn Urdu without knowing it, but
he was harmed by it, since he became conscious of his beauty
(Ahmed 2004: 630). Boys ogled the good-looking Muttila, making
him narcissistic (Ibid., 633). Women—albeit after his family had
rejected the match for their daughter—called him '*hijrā, zankhā*'
(effeminate, eunuch, hermaphrodite) (Ahmed 2004: 639). He was
always staring at the mirror and was not interested in his
ordinary-looking wife (Ibid., 641). The author describes Muttila's
getting facial hair in a full page. He tells us how the youth's
admirers forsook him and how he became lonely and sad (Ibid.,
642). But now Muttila turns to women and, of course, his taste
for Urdu poetry becomes stronger. Among others, he praises
Rind Lakhnavi's *Sarāpā* called '*Muraqqā-ē-khūbī*' which describes
and praises all parts of the woman's body as, indeed, all poems
of this genre do (Mohsin 1861).

In Nazir Ahmed's *Taubat un Nusūh* (1874), Nusuh, the
protagonist, who turns reformer after nearly dying of cholera,
tells his wife that poetry is considered bad because the poets

express the unclean (*nāpāk*) ideas of love and sensual gratification (*ishq ō ayyāshī*) (Ahmed 2004: 410). He finds his eldest son Kaleem's books obscene (*fahesh*), removed from modesty (*hayā sē dūr*), immoral and so on. So he burns them. The books which are burnt include the classics of Urdu poetry and were read by almost all educated people of the day though they are confined to specialists today.[1]

The Persian ones were *Bahār-ē-Dānish* and even Insha Ullah Khan's *Daryā-ē-Latāfat*. A 'good' boy—Bi Sahib's grandson—tells Saleem, Nusuh's younger son, that the *Vāsōkht* is a dirty (*gandī*) book (Ahmed 2004: 408). Later, Kaleem meets the Sadr-e-Azam, a maulvi in Daulatabad state, who tells him in Arabicized Urdu that poetry is a corrupting influence and he considers it worthless (Ahmed 2004: 444).

To take another example from literature, Abid Hussain, the protagonist of the novel *Sharīf Zādā* by Mirza Hadi Rusva (1857–1931), was not like other youths of Lucknow who were notorious for debauchery. While most young men acquired the habit of falling in love and took to versification, which enabled them to express lust in beautiful words, Abid Hussain worked hard (Rusva n.d.: 534). Such works, products of modernist, reforming Muslims as they were, reinforced the association of the erotic with Urdu poetry in the public imagination.

Both the exemplars of modern Urdu literature, Mohammad Hussain Azad (1830–1910) and Altaf Hussain Hali (1837–1914), discredited the medieval world-view, which included the description of female and boyish beauty as a perennial theme. Hali argues against the description of boyish beauty because, in his view, it is unnatural. As for female beauty, it is condemnable because if she is a beloved, one is revealing one's vices, and if a wife, it is shamelessness (Hali 1893: 112–113). Frances Pritchett has written in detail how modernity, spearheaded by Azad and Hali, discredited the themes, values and ideas of classical Urdu literature (Pritchett 1994), and one major area under attack,

as it were, was the treatment of beauty, love and sex. Even educational institutions held debates questioning the value of Urdu poetry. The Aligarh College, for instance, held a debate sometime between 1884 and 1901 on the motion that; 'Asiatic poetry has had a bad effect on morality'. The motion was supported by sixteen and opposed by eight people (Ikram 1971: 103). This was only to be expected given Hali's strictures against Urdu poetry in the '*Mad-ō-Jazr-ē-Islām*' (Hali 1879: 124–125).

Besides these great names, other reformers too associated Urdu literature with eroticism. Mumtaz Ali (1860–1935), a pioneer of Urdu journalism for women, wondered whether Meer Amman's *Bāgh-ō-Bahār*, that classic of Urdu prose for a century, was 'appropriate for either boys or girls' (Minault 1998: 83). Syed Husain Bilgrami, an influential man in Hyderabad, in his Presidential Address at the fourteenth meeting of the Mohammedan Education Conference held in Rampur in December 1900, considered Urdu literature as 'coarse, pernicious, and unclean' being a product of decadent, aristocratic (*nawābī*) culture (Quoted from Minault 1998: 207). Even more extremist was the puritanism of the ulema. Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi writes in his influential *Bahishtī Zēvar* (n.d.) that all novels and poetry should not be read by women on the grounds that they mention love. Moreover, he even places *Tafsīr Sūrāh Yusuf* (the exegesis of the Quranic verse of the Prophet Joseph) on the grounds that 'some of its traditions are inauthentic, and secondly, it contains stories of loving and being loved which are harmful for women' (Thanvi n.d., Part 10: 61). In short, there was an association of Urdu with the erotic and it was a source of anxiety for the reformers of Indian Muslim society. The reformers dealt with it in various ways: modernizing literary norms in Urdu with reference to English literature (Azad and Hali); creating new reformist texts (Nazir Ahmed); purging the canon of classical Urdu literature to create a sanitized, highly puritanical, pedagogical model for the mass consumption of the

Urdu-reading public, especially students (designers of curricula); and abandoning Urdu for English literature or language-teaching without the literary component (educational decision-makers; school teachers, college lecturers and even academics in universities).

But why did this association, disquieting as it was to people who wanted to break the British stereotype of Muslim sensuality and aristocratic (*nawābī*) decadence, come into existence? Did it have any basis in reality? These are questions to which answers will be sought in the following paragraphs.

THE PLACE OF THE EROTIC IN MUSLIM LITERATURE

Medieval literature in Muslim cultural languages—Arabic, Persian and Turkish—had an erotic content. This was a natural part of life among many others, and was not the exclusive focus of the narrative. It was formulaic in the sense that beauty, both female and boyish, was described in certain fixed, conventional terms. Sexual desire was also described as the normal response to beauty. The sexual organs, and intercourse itself, were described in metaphorical, stylized language, though at places, body parts were also referred to in words normally tabooed in society. This, however, was not in an erotic context as it is in pornography. The point is that, unlike the pornographer, the authors of classical literature in Muslim cultural languages were representing life—the whole of life that is—through certain conventional narrative devices.

Abdelwahab Bouhdiba, writing on the role of sexuality in Islamic cultures, suggests that eroticism 'is integrated in the Islamic view of the world and is situated at the heart, not at the periphery, of ethics' (Bouhdiba 1975: 127). Elaborating upon this theme he introduces the concept of *mujūn* which he explains as follows:

Observe the ambiguous and equivocal richness of the root *ma ja na,* which signifies, according to the *lisān al 'Arab*, the density, the depth, the lack of shame, the frivolity, the gratuity, the art of mixing the serious and the lighthearted, pretended austerity, true banter. *Mujūn* is the art of referring to the most indecent things, speaking about them in such a lighthearted way that one approaches them with a sort of loose humour. In principle *mujūn* ought not to go beyond words. It is oneirism, collective experience and liberation through speech (Bouhdiba 1975: 127).

The *One Thousand Nights and One Night* (*Alf Lailā wal Lail*) is considered an example of a narrative with erotic passages of the *mujūn* genre. But the famous *Alf Lailā*, paradigmatic though it is, is not the only example of literature with a healthy, accepting, attitude towards the erotic. Almost all the classics of Arabic, Persian and Turkish literature have the same attitude.

The *Masnavī* of Maulana Jalal-ad-Din Muhammad Rumi (1207–1273), considered one of the most influential works in the Muslim world, and one which educated South Asian Muslims were acquainted with and held in high esteem, is said to embody the esoteric meaning of the Quran (*hast Qur' ān dar zūbān-ē-Fārsī=* is the Quran in the Persian language). It is a six-volume work about the concept of the oneness of God (*tawhīd*), redemption of the soul through mystical processes, the desire to seek union with the deity and other moral and spiritual themes. These themes are expressed through anecdotes, fables and aphorisms. And yet, in common with medieval norms of writing in the Muslim world, there are fables which would now be considered erotic and even obscene. Rumi also uses both the accepted, respectable words for the human anatomy, and also ones which have earthy connotations and are tabooed in respectable writings today (collected in an appendix and defended against the charge of indecency by Iqbal 1956: 284–314).[2] Modern Pakistanis would find them shockingly indelicate

and teaching them to students of any age would be out of the question.

BOY LOVE IN URDU-USING LITERATURE AND SOCIETY

The literature known to Indian Urdu-using educated people was mostly Persian and Urdu during the British era, when English literature, too, became part of the world-view of the educated classes. Some classics of Arabic literature, too, were known through translations but the originals in Arabic were known only to the ulema. The most embarrassing theme for the British and the Muslim reformers was what the British called the 'unspeakable vice of the Greeks' (and Orientals) and the reformers '*amrad parastī*' (literally: worship of the beautiful youth). This, however, requires some understanding of the construction of gender in Urdu, Persian and Turkish literatures. The sexual categorization in this literature, mostly that which is rooted in the Iranian cultural tradition, is very different from the one which has gained ascendancy with the universalizaton of Western discursive ideologies. For instance, man (*mard*) was seen as the lover (in amorous terms) and the penetrator (in erotic ones) while the beloveds or objects of desire were beautiful women (*zan*) as well as boys (*amrad*=adolescent youths). As such, this literature was not shamefaced about men's aesthetic and erotic appreciation of beautiful, adolescent boys in addition to women as love objects. Even great mystic saints are said to be partial to boyish beauty though the sources also insist on the virtuous nature of their appreciation of ephebic beauty. Sheikh Gesu Daraz narrates the story of Sheikh Ohad Kirmani on 11 Ramazan 802/1400, who liked beautiful youths (*amrad*). Incensed by this, a Turkish youth decided to murder him but the Sheikh declaimed amorous Persian poetry to him and when the youth did attack him with a knife, the Sheikh cast an angry glance at him which killed him on the spot (Hussaini 1401: 294–95). Similarly, the Sheikh also narrated on 30 Shaban

802/1400, how Khwaja Nizamuddin's musician, Hasan Maimandi, fell in love with a boy. This boy set his heart on a beautiful dress worn by a rich man and Hasan had to request Maulana Mahmood Avadhi to somehow obtain the dress. The Maulana perforce had to present a rare book to the owner to get the dress for his friend Hasan's beloved (Hussaini 1401: 233–234). All this is narrated under the theme of good treatment for one's *pīr's* servants so there is acceptance of such relationships as matters of daily occurrence.

No theory of abnormality or effeminacy was invoked to explain this categorization. The appropriate gender role for the man was to respond sexually to the beauty of both women and boys. However, one could show a preference for one or the other kind of sex object at different periods of life. The particular construction of the category called 'homosexual' to include boy-lovers, and associating them with 'difference' and even abnormality and effeminacy, was a European phenomenon of a much later date (McIntosh 1968; Plummer 1981; Foucault 1976–1984; Foucault 1980: 220–221; Rahman 1988).

To equate such attitudes with 'liberalism', as used in contemporary parlance, would be to miss the point. While modern liberal, emancipatory, egalitarian, and humanitarian values would give freedom of sexual choice to all without stigmatizing certain preferences, the medieval values mentioned previously do not pretend to do that at all. Boys, and above all, adult men who still prefer to be anally penetrated, are despised. Even Rumi reserves the most contemptuous terms for such people (Rumi *c.* 13th century, Vol. 5: 255). Foucault explains this attitude with reference to the Greeks as follows:

> The Greek ethics of pleasure is linked to a virile society, to dissymmetry, exclusion of the other, an obsession with penetration, and a kind of threat of being dispossessed of your own energy, and so on (Foucault 1984: 346).

Turkish and Persianate societies (societies with the cultural influence of medieval Iran) have similar sexual attitudes so there was freedom from stigma (except for the clergy who were against all kinds of sex outside the polygamous marriage and concubinage institution) for men who took the conventional role of lovers, wooers and penetrators of the bodies of women and boys, but not for the latter themselves. However, some of the Sufis narrated incidents of eunuchs and hermaphrodites (*mukhannas*) being close to God as the one by Khwaja Gesu Daraz who narrates how a hermaphrodite's prayers brought rain (Hussaini 1401: 410).

The pervasiveness of boy-love in Persian and Turkish cultures is brought out, respectively, by Najmabadi (2005) and Andrews and Kalpakli (2005). Najmabadi makes the astute observation mentioned previously that the pre-modern beloved was a boy (*amrad*) who, like women (*zan*), belonged to the category of those who could be penetrated. Modernity changed this and Iranians became ashamed of this fact of their cultural past. The public space became hetero-socialized and male homosociality was heterosexualized during this era. Women's education, too, was seen in the light of this new female identity as it was in India (Najmabadi 2005: 196). The *amrad* disappeared from cultural imagination. Even the feminist reading of sexuality and gender identity has 'contributed to this historical amnesia by doing gender analysis without regard for the historical transformations of sexuality' (Ibid., 235). Such an analysis is required for the Urdu-using culture of North India where gender was perceived in the same way as in Iran. The role of the *amrad* in this culture, as expressed in the Urdu language, has not been fully analyzed.

The lines along which the culture of eighteenth century Indian Urdu-using elite can be analyzed is provided, in addition to Persian cultural traditions, to those of Turkey described in a book entitled *The Age of Beloveds* (Andrews and Kalpakli 2005). The authors contend that, in the long sixteenth century, 'a

period running from the late fifteenth century through the early seventeenth' (Andrews and Kalpakli 2005: 10)—the ideal beloved was an adolescent youth (an *amrad*) who also symbolized the absolute ruler as well as the immanent deity in mystic love. The argument is that:

> ... during this period power relations of all kinds, from the most personal (adult-child, husband-wife, lover-beloved) to the most public (courtier-monarch, patron-client, even empire-empire), were eroticized on a consistent pattern. That is, they were imagined in the forms, the language, and the metaphors of love (Ibid., 28).

The authors contend that the *sehrengiz* was written as a catalogue celebrating the beauty of boys, generally artisan lads (Ibid., 40). This is common to Urdu poetry (*shahr āshōb*) also. Like Persian, the gender of Ottoman literature is also masculine and 'reflects and scripts the (adult) masculinity of public space' (Ibid., 54). This, again, is also true of Urdu culture. The authors describe how, during this age, it was fashionable to be enamoured of boys, use the ghazal (in Turkish *gazel*) as a medium of communicating about the beloved and the use of certain literary practices and conventions for the above (Ibid., 90). This, again, is true for the Urdu culture. However, it needs to be investigated in more detail (for initial steps in this direction see Naim 1979: 120–142; Rahman 1990: 1–20).

LOSS OF POLITICAL POWER AND SEXUAL INDULGENCE

A reading of texts from the medieval Indian period clearly shows that power was manifested in the possession of coercive ability which gave a person the ability to gratify himself (women were generally excluded from power) by possessing tangible and intangible goods (such as prestige). Among the tangible goods were sex objects—women and beautiful boys. Thus the Mughal rulers had large harems (Lal 1988) and a very active sex life. It

was when political power was lost that people, especially reformers and apologists of this ruthless power, started propagating the theory that sexual excesses or promiscuity brought about the ruin of the Mughal (or some other) empire.

Although Muslim political power was challenged by the eighteenth century in India, their cultural dominance was very much in place. Indeed, the British rulers themselves adopted the dress, etiquette, cuisine, and values—and even the religion some-times—of the aristocratic Persianate Muslims becoming what William Dalrymple calls the 'white Mughals' (Dalrymple 2003). Thus, it was not a new breakdown of sexual norms, but a continuation of older established patterns—established during the age of political power—which oft-quoted works like the *Muraqqā-ē-Dillī* represent. The *Muraqqā's* author, Dargah Quli Khan (1710–1766) was a nobleman from Aurangabad who lived in Delhi from 1738 to 1741. He describes the capital of the declining Mughal empire as a place devoted to pleasures of all kinds. The public places were full of beautiful women and boys and the powerful indulged themselves with both (Khan *c*. 18th century). The descriptions of boy dancers and women who painted their bare legs as if they were wearing tight trousers, may give one the feeling that Delhi was the most decadent of cities in the eighteenth century (Ibid., 67–82). But Paris and London, at the height of their colonial power, had all the pleasures which Delhi possessed (Bloch 1958: 217–252). Similarly, the Lucknow of the Nawabs, which Abdul Halim Sharar describes, was not more profligate than, say, London, though, of course, the practice of having many women in the harem was reminiscent of medieval Muslim and Rajput capitals at the height of their power. The social and literary norms for describing the sexual practices of European cities were, of course, different. But they were not any more virtuous even in Victorian England than Indian cities. Thus, the real reason why the erotic element in Urdu literature is condemned so unequivocally since the

nineteenth century is not because such pleasures were found in certain urban centres or the rich indulged in them but because it is the product of a militarily defeated culture. And, when one is defeated, everything one does or possesses can be, and generally is, condemned. The defeat is not easy to explain and the tendency of everyone, most of all the reformers of the defeated party, is to blame pleasure, especially sexual pleasure, for the defeat.

THE EROTIC THEME IN EARLY URDU WRITINGS

The earliest specimens of the erotic in Urdu poetry go back to the time of Muslim power, not to its decline. A certain poet called Qureshi wrote a *masnavī* called '*Bhōg Bhal*' in 1022/1613 in Dakhni Urdu[3] (Hashmi 1923: 285). It has twelve chapters describing sexual matters. The book is a translation of Pandit Kal Kok's book called *Ratī Rahas*, and its manuscript in the Salar Jang Museum in Hyderabad has 2,860 couplets whereas the original (*Rati Rahas*) has only 800 (Jafer in Jafer and Jain Vol 2, 1998: 424–433).

However, since Urdu came into its own at the time of the decline of Muslim political power, probably the most obscene of the Urdu poets is also one of the earliest, at least in North India. This is Meer Mohammad Jafar Zatalli (d. 1713). He was a satirist in both Persian and Urdu and the obscene words he uses are not a part of the Urdu erotic tradition. Nor are they meant for evoking sexual pleasure. Instead, they are obviously meant to shock, outrage, express contempt, and belittle others. Zatalli lived at a time of political instability after Aurangzeb's death. He responded to it by making fun of it. He was murdered, probably at the instigation of King Farrukh Siyar in 1713 (see his works edited by Khan 2003). Zatalli created no tradition. His effect upon Urdu literature is minimal. So it is not because of his use of obscenities that Urdu literature came to be associated with love and sex.

Another eighteenth century work is Sayyid Sirajuddin Aurang-abadi's (1715–1763) *Bōstān-ē-khayāl* This is actually a sufi narrative about finding the source of permanent bliss. The narrator loves a boy who is indifferent to him. Although another boy, the son of a chief (*Sardār*), gives him attention, the narrator remains disconsolate. The beloved alternates between warmth and cold disdain until the narrator turns to God in whom he finds real love (Sarwari 1998: 149–246).

Najmuddin Shah Mubarak Abru (1683–1733), one of the pioneers of the Urdu ghazal in North India, wrote a poem called 'Advice for the Adornment of a Beloved'. In this poem, the narrator meets a beautiful boy who is, however, unsophisticated in the art of charming men. The narrator starts advising him how to behave like a 'beloved' (*mā'shūq*). Above all, the boy must know when to stop behaving like a 'beloved' and become a lover ('*āshiq*) in his turn. So, when the hair on his face coarsen, he must 'then give up the desire to be adored/don't overdress or act coy any more'. That is when he must transit to the role of the lover and 'enjoy the company of beauteous ones' (Abru *c.* 18th century, English translation in Vanita and Kidwai 2000: 161–168).

But Abru's focus is not pornography; nor even erotica. He is discussing the norms of role-playing in a conventional society. Moreover, he is upholding decency because, like the behavioural norms enjoined upon the Greek boy (*eromenos* or *ephebe*) (Dover 1978: 16), there were certain forms of good behaviour expected from the *amrad* also. Abdul Haleem Sharar also tells us that adolescent boys combed their hair in such a way on their foreheads that 'attraction like women was created in them also' (Sharar 1927: 261).

THE PORNOGRAPHIC MINORITY

There were, to be sure, pornographers (*fahash gō*) also. They wrote poetry called the *hazal* or, more loosely, *kalām-ē-fahash* (obscene verse). One of them, Saiyid Iman Ali Khan of Bilgram,

writing under the pseudonym of Sahib-ē-Qirān, has left behind a collection of verse written in black in the *nastālīq* script (Sahib-ē-Qiran *c.* 1811). He flourished during the rule of Asif ud Daulah as he has been mentioned in several couplets. At one place, the *Nawab* has been praised as a promoter of concupiscence (*shahvat*). Most of the verses are obscene and some mention the poet's exploits in the brothel. In some cases the names of prostitutes are also mentioned but mostly, like all pornographers, the poet is concerned with types of fornication. According to Sharar, Mian Mashir, another *hazal gō,* perfected Sahib-e-Qiran's style of using language idiomatically in this sub-genre (Sharar 1927: 122).

The Rampur Raza Library has a large collection of *Hazliāt*. These seven handwritten manuscripts, though all entitled *Majmu'ā Hazliāt*, are written by different people. One (No. 1411) carries the names of two authors: Miss Flora and Sharir or Mir Hasan Ali. Others are by Mir Ashiq Hussain Bazm (Bazm 1908 and 1909); Agha Wasi Ali Khan Lakhnawi Mazhar (d. 1912) (Mazhar n.d.); Hayat Baksh Mustafa Abidi Rasa (d. 1913) (Rasa n.d.); Syed Jawad Husain Amrohi Shamim (d. 1915); and Syed Ali Husain (Husain n.d.). Another notable pornographic poet is Kallan Khan who wrote under the poetic name of Bechaen (1908). He was a student of Jan Sahib of Lucknow who is well-known for his *rekhtī* poetry. Bechaen was in the court of the Nawab of Rampur as well as Maharaja Ranbhir Singh. His verses were collected together by Qudrat Ali Qudrat in 1907–08. Out of all the *hazal gō* poets of the period, Bechaen's work is among the most pornographic. He writes mostly in Urdu but there are poems in Persian too. The Urdu ones refer to all sorts of sexual activities—the combinations and permutations of the human body which is the distinctive feature of all pornography everywhere.

An oddity among these kinds of poets is Chirkeen, whose *Dīvān* falls in the sub-genre of the *hazal*, but is distinctive in that he refers more to excretion than to sex. He is also one of the few, even among the *hazal gōs*, to write on menstruation. Excretion is

an obsession with him and even when he is mentioning sexual acts he brings in some allusion to excretion.

The other collections of the *hazal* use sex in order to continue the war of words between poets—or a hapless victim of a poet's satirical wit—through invective. Sex is used as a weapon; a device for insulting people; a means of embarrassing them. And this usage is based on the assumptions and values of a feudal society in which the crude use of power is a reality of life. In this society, sexual acts outside the institution of marriage—in which case they were not discussed—were seen as conquests. For the male, they brought honour; for the female, dishonour. And if a male (boy, eunuch or man) took the female role (of being penetrated) there was even more dishonour for him than for his female counterpart. It is in the context of these power relations and perceptions of reality that the world-view of these anthologies of the *hazal* must be understood.

It is necessary to state, then, that the *hazal*—taking these collections as a whole—is neither part of erotica nor even of pornography. It is really part of satire (*hajv*) but it uses sexual invectives, tabooed words and acts in order to insult a person and continues to attack and humiliate its victims through sexual allusions and imagery. It yields no sexual pleasure, not even of the kind which pornography can, and of course, it is not erotic in any artistic sense of the word.

To give a few examples, Bazm narrates the story of a woman who has five lovers from the working classes—the lowest of the low in society, association with whom brings dishonour, even if it is not of a sexual nature. Her husband, who cannot satisfy her, sees his insatiable wife's goings-on with all of them. The purpose of the poem is to insult the man and his wife and not to excite lust. The poet sometimes names the butt of his insults—a certain Mazhar who is probably his poetic rival—whose wife and daughter are sexually exploited by the poet (Bazm 1908).

Rasa insults a man called Sameem, boasting about taking his mother, wife and daughter. He even mentions bestiality but, again, to insult Sameem, whose sister is sexually abused by a bull dog. It is worth mentioning that the poetic collection does not begin with the usual '*bismillah*'; it begins with '*Yā Shaitān ul Rajīm*' (O! Satan who was cursed!). Rasa also mentions a European woman (*Mēm*) called Flora by name (Rasa 1909).

But perhaps the only pornographer with any influence was Sa'adat Yar Khan Rangin, who wrote his *Dīvān-ē-Āmēkhtā* as well as *Dīvān-ē-Angēkhtā* on erotic themes. Like the work of Sahib-e-Qiran, Rangin's work is also full of obscenities and boastful exploits of copulation with prostitutes. It begins with praise for the Satan which is not the usual pattern of Urdu pornographers.

> *Lānat mẽ kōi sharīk nahĩ tērā dūsrā jitnē haẽ randī bāz tū ūnkā haẽ raẽhnumā* (No one shares with you in the distinction of being the accursed one. Thou art the guide of all the world's womanizers).

Here too some prostitutes are mentioned by name but most remain anonymous. The *dīvān* ends with the praise of Satan as the provider of carnal pleasures.

The *Dīvān-ē-Angekhtā* is about women's language which, according to the author, he heard during his womanizing days. Apart from the prostitutes themselves, he claims to have had access to married women (*khāngī*) from respectable families who formed occasional liaisons with men for fun or, possibly, some personal income. This language is called '*Rēkhtī*' and Rangin is said to be the author of this genre of poetry which will be mentioned in more detail later (see Rangin n.d., Insha 1802: 52–53). However, the language of respectable ladies—*bēgmātī zubān*—is given in *Hādi-un-Nisā*, which contains letters from and to women, songs, idiomatic phrases, witty couplets, in which a teasing maiden recites poetic lines with double entendres and sexual innuendoes, (*kaēh mukarniâ*) and so on (Dehlavi 1875). The

rēkẖtī is restricted to sexual innuendo, humour, repartee, the quarrelling tone, the scabrous tone, and the obscene.

Elements of the *hazal*—couplets and even complete poems—are found interspersed in the works of some of the classical poets. Only a few, however, are mentioned as '*hazal gō*': Mir Zahik, father of Mir Hasan, for instance, was one of them (Qureshi 1966: 9). These days they are either not printed or printed with blank spaces in their poetic collections.

While the works of Rangin and maybe some other porno-graphers may have reinforced Urdu's association with the erotic, it was not the major factor in creating this association. Obscenity, after all, is a part of all languages and remains on the margins of all literatures. Much more was contributed to the creation of this association by the erotic sub-genres in Urdu which were not, however, pornographic.

THE EROTIC GENRES OF POETRY

There are sub-genres of Urdu poetry which are not pornographic but may be called erotic. In one of these, the *Sarāpā Sukhan*, the language remains literary and beautiful. In the other, the *Rēkẖtī*, it degenerates into the ridiculous, the frivolous and the misogynist. The *Sarāpā*, as mentioned above, is a collection of couplets on every part of the beloved's body, starting from her hair to her heels. The breasts, buttocks, legs, and vagina are all described through metaphors and highly poetic similes. Her beauty is always described in formulaic terms without any attempt at individuation. Obscene words are never used but the poet does use the more sophisticated Persian words for body parts. Examples are as follows:

Feet: *Aōr jō hāthõ mẽ uṭhā lũ tō ajab lutf uṯhāũ*
            Phir jō vō lutf uṯhānā tujhē biṭhā kē dikhlāũ (Jurrat).
            (And if I lift the feet I would find a strange pleasure

And then to make you sit and watch that pleasure-taking)

Breasts: *Gōl ubhrē huẽ kyā us kē haẽ pistā dōnõ*
Mast karnē kō haẽ mā' jūn kī dibyã dōnõ (Himmat)
(How rounded and raised are both the breasts.
To intoxicate, these are containers of intoxicants both)

Buttocks: *Kōh-ē-suraẽn dēkhō tō sar phōṛ ō tum*
and thighs *Ranẽ makhmal sī haẽ khuāb-ō-khurash chōṛō tum* (Mahar)
(And if you see the mountains of the derriere you would knock out
your head/and the thighs are like satin—enough to make you leave all dreaming and thinking)

Vagina: *haē kamar bāl sī dēkhō jo b'aēn-ē-insāf*
Dāman kē nēha haē dil-ē-āshiq ka shigāf
(The waist is like a hair; if you observe with justice
Below the front of the shirt concealed lies the cleavage of the heart of the lover)

The *sarāpā* is interspersed in the versified tales of the *masnavī* and the *vāsōkht*, especially the latter. The *vāsōkht* is a formulaic story of the narrator wooing a beautiful beloved who is described in detail. The beloved alternates between indifference and passion. The narrator takes revenge of her indifference by pretending to love somebody else who, in turn, is described much in the same conventional terms as the first beloved. The drama succeeds in bringing the lovers together again. Sometimes, however, the ending is tragic (see the work of Fida Ali whose poetic name is Aesh. Ali 1829). Among the books read by the Muslim gentlemen of India was the notorious Persian work, *Bahār-ē-Dānish*, which was condemned by many Victorian British officers in various reports. These tales not only have erotic scenes but also feature a kind of defiant and wayward female sexuality which expresses itself by cheating the husband in a daredevil way. For instance, some of the women fornicate with a youth in the presence of their husband. This book was

eventually thrown out of the curricula but it was translated into Urdu, notably by Mirza Jan Tapish. He translated the Persian work during his stay in Fort William College, Calcutta in 1802 (the couplet giving the date is in *Bagh-o-Bahar* and it adds up to 1217/1802). Modern translations purge out some couplets which are considered obscene but, in 1802, the work was acceptable to the authorities of Fort William College who are praised in it.

Another widely circulated tale (*dāstān*) was the *Talism-ē-Hōsh Rubā* or *Dāstān-ē-Amīr Hamzā*. This was translated from Persian to Urdu by Munshi Syed Mohammad Husain Jah (1908–1915). The stories of the great primal battle between good and evil—good personified by Amir Hamza and evil by the magician Afrasyab— have all the elements of public entertainment: magic, war, deceit, trickery, sex, and merry-making. These tales were read out by professional storytellers (*dāstāngōs*) who acted out the dramatic scenes and mimicked the actors' voices to create a riveting rendition which reached audiences who could not themselves read the seven thousand plus pages (in the present Sang-e-Meel edition). The tales describe scenes of drinking and female beauty every now and then. As in other works, the descriptions of women (*sarāpā*) are in the same formulaic terms as in Persian and Arabic literature: long black tresses, large dow-like eyes, full sensual lips, full breasts, narrow waist, curvaceous hips, rounded buttocks, and sensual thighs. Sexual organs are described in metaphors, as is common in the *sarāpās*, and if body parts are named, sophisticated Persian words are used for them. In the ambience the tales create, the erotic, as in other Islamicate literature, is very much a part of life and it is life which the tales reflect. The *Talism*, with its wide popular appeal, took the erotic expressed in the Urdu language to the literate public.

The *Rēkhtī* is written in a 'feminine' voice but this voice is satirical and mocking. It makes fun of the feminine, trivializing and vulgarizing it. It has already been mentioned that Rangin is credited with having pioneered it though, in fact, there are

occasional poems in a pseudo-feminine voice from earlier poets. However, Insha's claim that Rangin invented it to induce women to lewdness so he could seduce them (Insha 1802: 52–53), is an exaggeration. In any case, this claim has been made by a comic character in *Daryā-ē-Latāfat*, called Mir Ghafar Ghaeni, and it is not possible to determine what truth value the author wishes to ascribe to it.

Rēkhtī is course, facetious and licentious though hardly seductive. It provokes either disgust or risibility, though hardly lust as erotica should (for a study of *Rēkhtī* in Urdu with many examples see Mushir 1974; Kazmi 1930; and for translations into English see Petievich 2007: 279–353). The *rēkhtī* presents a lustful, aggressive, rather high-spirited woman. She is not idealized like the beloved of the ghazal. Instead, she is constantly being held to ridicule and has to hold her own against seducing men and scheming women. Very often she has a not-so-secret liaison with another woman: either a girl friend (*dōgānā, ilaichī*) or the nurse (the ubiquitous *annā*); and sometimes an older woman (*bājī*). However, because of the earthiness of these goings-on, the voice of the *rēkhtī* is a full-blooded one; a real life one. In real life, however, there is much more than sex; the *rēkhtī*' however, is obsessed with sex to the exclusion of other things in life. It is one-dimensional. Its purpose is not to represent women but to ridicule them.

While the Urdu sources—Kazmi (1930) and Mushir (1974)—merely give samples of *Rēkhtī* couplets along with literary appreciation modified by the presently mandatory condemnation of indecency—recent criticism in English engages with more complex dimensions of this unusual sub-genre of Urdu literature. Ruth Vanita and Saleem Kidwai (2000: 193) defend it on the grounds that it 'represents women clearly stating that they prefer women to men when they have access to both' (Ibid., 193). Petievich argues that the new criticism, that of the Hindu right in India and the Islamists in Pakistan, have created a culture

shame for the *rēkhtī* because it was women's language and expresses lesbianism (Petievich 2001: 248; 2007: 274). Moreover, according to Ruth Vanita, the *rēkhtī* was purged from the Urdu canon because it draws upon 'literary conventions drawn from non-Islamic sources' (Vanita 2004: 15). In short, being in ordinary Urdu (Hindustani), it was linguistically subversive during a period of hardening Muslim/Hindu identities. Carla Petievich argues that the suppression of this poetic genre is because of 'its frank assumption of lesbian eroticism in rekhti' (Petievich 2007: 275). C.M. Naim, however, defends the more orthodox view that it is trivial, misogynist and meant only for male titillation (Naim 2001).

While interpretations of the *Rēkhtī* in terms of identity, realism and the expression of lesbian feelings is new and interesting, it does not seem to be convincing, at least for this writer. A full reading of the original sources reinforces the earlier view that the *rēkhtī* was written by men and was used to entertain men (Naim 2001: 23). Indeed, it is recited even now in all-male gatherings in Pakistan and India to make men laugh. It made so much fun of women that it made travesties or caricatures of them and misrepresented them. It was a joke and, like all jokes, it created stereotypes and figures of fun. It was obviously a bawdy relief from the high-minded, idealized, romantic love of the ghazal. But it was not even subversive of the universe of the ghazal. It merely confirmed its existence by pointing out that real people, in moods of banter, could exist on much lower planes where women were not the androgynous ethereal beings of the ghazal.

The *rēkhtī* poets—Insha (1756–1817); Mir Yar Ali Jan Sahib (1810–1881); Nisar Husain Khan Shaida (b. 1868); Saiyed Sajid Sajni (1922–1993)—have not been ranked high among Urdu poets for their *rēkhtī* works at least. In Mirza Hadi Rusva's novel *Umraō jān Adā* (1899), the *rēkhtī* poets are ranked as non-serious (Rusva 1899:84). Some of the poets themselves have written of their

work in terms of macho self-confidence expressed in terms of ridicule for the feminine. As Jan Sahib has it:

> *Qadr kyā nāmard jānẽ, marduē jō mard haẽ*
> *Jān Sahib shād hōtē haẽ vōhī sun kar mujhē*
> (The unmanly would never appreciate me; only men would
> who are real men/And they, Jan Sahib, are entertained when they
> hear me).

The 'real men' heard about women talking about their under garments, especially the brassiere (*angiā* or *mahram*) to the confidante: the nurse (*annā*) or a friend. The *angiā* is a subject of great fascination. There are complaints about its being too light, too heavy, too gaudy, and that the male lover (*marduā*) has torn it to pieces or thrown it away. Sometimes she demands it as a present while at others she hides it from the prying eyes of intrusive men. Sometimes the female friends—the words used by Rangin are *dōgānā*, *ilaichi* and *zannākhī*—are also sexual partners. In such cases they ridicule the men and indulge in tabooed pleasures. However, it is only rarely that this is expressed without ridicule and when it is, as in the *chaptināmās* of Jurrat, it is to provide sexual pleasure to men. Qalandar Baksh Jurrat (1748–1810), noted for salaciousness even in his ghazal, has written about two women, Sakkho and Mukkho, who complain against their husbands and invite all women who 'are given to clinging' (Vanita and Kidwai 2000: 222). They make love passionately as described below:

> When you join your lips to my lips,
> It feels as if new life pours into my being,
> When breast meets breast, the pleasure is such.
> That from sheer joy the words rise to my lips.
> The way you rub me, oh?...
> (English translation by Vanita and Kidwai 2000: 223).

In such samples the passion dominates the ridicule. In most others, however, the dominating tone is satirical, marginalizing, ridiculing. One couplet is as follows:

> *Rangīn qasam haĕ tērī hī hŭ maēlē sar sē maĕ*
> *Mat khōl kar kē minnat ō zārī izārband* (Rangin)
> (Rangin I swear to you I am having my periods
> Do not keep pestering me to open the band of my trousers)

It seems to me that it was not only because of the non-standard Urdu that the *rēkhtī* was purged as Petievich contends (2007: 272). After all, the *dōhā* remains respectable, though of minor interest, despite its use of 'Hindi' words and Nazeer Akbarabadi's poems on the poor remain popular even today and are included in the curricula. The *Rēkhtī*, on the other hand, was simply too unrestrained, non-serious, sexist, and rambunctious. In an age of increasing puritanism when even the Persian classics were purged, it could not be countenanced by reformers keen to assert the respectability of their literary legacy. However, it would not really be accurate to say that it was purged. In fact it was never actually included in the canon of Urdu literature. It was a joke to begin with and remained one throughout its career. However, because it was quoted for fun in male gatherings as a joke, it may have contributed to the impression that Urdu was the natural language of erotica.

The *masnavī*, which is a love story in the medieval fairy tale tradition, has more erotic descriptions of feminine beauty and scenes of love-making than any other genre of canonical Urdu literature, except the *vāsōkht* which, in a sense, is a formulaic *masnavī* in miniature.

There are, however, two traditions in the *masnavī*, like the ghazal but unlike the *vāsokht*, that of 'earthly' and 'celestial' love (Suvorova 2000: 1–41). The earliest *masnavīs* were written in the southern centres of the Urdu language, the Deccan and Gujarat. The earliest one, *Kadam Rao, Padam Rao*, has been described

earlier and need not detain us here. Suffice it to note that it was in the 'celestial' tradition and that the Deccan as well as Gujarat, had many elements from the indigenous culture and very often one of the lovers was Hindu (Suvorova 2000: 24–28).

When the centre of Urdu literature shifted to the north, the masters of the ghazal, like Mir Taqi Mir (1724–1810), continued to write *masnavīs* too. Mir, for instance, wrote eight *masnavīs* of a romantic nature. Like his ghazal*s*, they are more concerned with deep, romantic love than ephemeral lust. The erotic *masnavī*, still masquerading as a love story, came into its own in Awadh. Mir Hasan (b. 1727), born in Delhi but settled in Faizabad, is famous for his *masnavīs* such as the *Saehrul Bayān.*

The story is about Prince Benazir and Princess Badr-i-Munir. They fall in love and Najmunnisa, the Vizier's daughter, advises her to yield to passion. Badr-i-Munir allows Benazir to make love to her. The scene of copulation is described in a formulaic manner (an early example being from Manjhan for the translation of which in English see Behl and Weightman 2000: 190).

This is true of most *masnavīs* of Urdu—especially those written in Lucknow or under the influence of Lucknow's eroticism. According to Suvorova, 'we come across similar more or less uninhibited descriptions of amorous intimacy in most of the Urdu *dastans* and '*dastan*-like' *masnavīs* (Suvorova 2000: 146).

The *masnavīs* of Diya Shankar Nasim (*Gulzār-ē-Nasīm*) and of Tasadduq Husain Khan (Nawab Mirza Shauq) (1773–1871) are famous for their stylistic beauty. However, Shauq is an innovator in that he introduces realism in the *masnavī*. While the previous *masnavīs* mostly described fairy-tale characters, this one describes the passions of the boys and girls of contemporary Lucknow.

In his *masnavīs*, Shauq describes rendezvous with beautiful, veiled young ladies who are initially tricked by the lover into meeting them. The girl usually has a cunning maid servant who is bribed into making her palanquin-bearers leave her in a vacant

house or garden. There the lover approaches her with seductive words and professions of ardour. She rejects him initially but eventually yields. In *Farēb-ē-Ishq* (written before 1849) the man seduces the girl who eventually dies. In *Bahār-ē-Ishq* (1849) the families are scandalized but they get the lovers married. However, in *Zahr-ē-Ishq* (1862) they both try to commit suicide though only the girl dies (Shauq *c.* 19th century).

Abdul Halim Sharar blames Wajid Ali Shah's debauchery, or rather his advertisement of it, on his reading of Shauq's *masnavīs* (Sharar 1927: 96). As Suvorova points out, this is unproven and unprovable (2000: 218), but Shauq, as well as the Nawab, contributed to the association of eroticism with Urdu poetry, and indirectly with the language itself, at least with reference to Lucknow and its Urdu poetry.

Nazeer Akbarabadi (1735–1830), often called a people's poet or a 'realist', has erotic appeal in many of his poems. Whether on a festive occasion—Eid, Shab-e-Bārāt, Hōlī, Dīvālī or a fair (*mēlā*)—he mentions beautiful women and boys. Incidents like a storm are occasions for kissing or fondling a beauty and dreams, of course, are an excuse for describing them. In Nazeer, because of the quality of realism, we get a sense of how forbidden pleasures made people yearn for them and act, even if in imagination, as thieves and robbers of delights (see *Kulliyāt-ē-Nazīr*). Nazeer uses words in common use, including obscene ones, which have been expunged in modern editions so that there are blanks in many poems, especially those describing festive occasions. For instance, he uses the excuse of showing exotic pet animals to boys in order to take sexual advantage of them ('*Biyā*', '*Gilaehrī kā bachchā*' etc.) (Akbarabadi 1820).

THE SEDUCTIVE CHARM OF THE URDU GHAZAL

The ghazal, not necessarily the explicitly erotic version associated with Lucknow, but the whole genre in general, contributed most to the image of Urdu as an amorous and erotic

language. The beloved of the Ghazal—whether the elusive deity, courtesan, veiled lady or adolescent boy—is beautiful but indifferent. The poet-lover's passion is, therefore, unrequited. Thus, the poet accuses the beloved of being cruel and faithless (*bē wafā*).

> *Charā garī bīmarī-ē-dil kī rasm-ē-shaher-ē husn nahĩ*
> *Varnā dilbar nādã bhī is dard kā chārā jānē haē* (Mir)
> (It is not the custom of the dwellers of the city of beauty to give solace to anybody Otherwise even an innocent beauty knows how to provide a cure for the disease of love).

The beloved appears to favour the rival (*dushman, ghaēr, raqīb*). And Ghalib invests the situation with inimitable humour.

> *Maẽ nē kahā bazm-ē-nāz mẽ chahiyē ghaēr sē tahī*
> *Sun kē sitam zarīf nē mujh kō uṭhā diyā kē yũ*
> (I asked the beloved that this gathering of charm should exclude the rival/upon hearing this she made me get up saying 'like this'.

The lover is condemned to separation (*hijr*) from the object of his love. He cries, sighs and grows pale and ill with the pain of separation.

> *Chupkē chupkē rāt din ãsū bahānā yād haē*
> *Ham kō ab tak āshiqī kā vō zamānā yād haē* (Hasrat Mohani)
> (Shedding tears night and day quietly I remember/the days of that love affair I remember).

These themes—romantic love, separation, fidelity on the part of the lover, indifference, and fickleness on the part of the beloved—were reiterated throughout the three-hundred year tradition, dating at least from Vali Dakkani (1667–1707) (even if the earlier one is not part of the common people's consciousness) of the Urdu ghazal.

The ghazal had a special place in the lives of educated people—both Hindus and Muslims—in North India. Even in other parts of India—Hyderabad, Murshidabad, Mysore, Lahore, etc.—the elite enjoyed the ghazal as a distinctive cultural artefact. It was customary for educated, urbane men to learn several hundred couplets of the masters of the Urdu ghazal. These would be recited to make the conversation interesting. By the 1920s, when Modern Hindi had overtaken Urdu as the language of printing in North India, Urdu poetry would appear in journals of Hindi. Moreover, 'collections of popular ghazals were printed more often in Devanagari than in the Perso-Arabic script, thus transmitting the taste for Urdu poetry to the wider public of new Hindi literates' (Orsini 2002: 49–50). Urdu couplets featured in popular theatre and evoked a well-known and experienced response of tenderness, romance and the appreciation of the aesthetic in literature and life (Orsini 2002: 50). *Mushairās*, called *kavī sammelans* in Hindi, were common and are held even now in the South Asia diaspora settled in the United States and Europe, where Urdu poets are welcomed and people come to listen to them and enjoy the ghazal as well as the more recent genres of poetry. People played *baēt bāzī* in which one person recited a couplet and the other player had to recite a couplet in response, beginning with the last sound (denoted by the letter of the Urdu alphabet) of the last line. This went on till one of the parties ran out of couplets. This has changed into *antāksharī* in Hindi where film songs, instead of the classical works of the Urdu poets, are used. However, although even if the official language of the songs in India is said to be Hindi, it is closer to the Urdu end of the linguistic spectrum than Sanskritized Hindi. In any case the Hindi movie is strongly influenced by the amorous orientation of Nawabi Lucknow and, therefore, reminiscent of the link between Urdu and the life of love (Kesavan 1994: 255–256)—a point which will be taken up in more detail later.

Very often, couplet after couplet, by the great masters, was recited only for the pleasure of it. Such an evening and the special romantic atmosphere it created is described by E.M. Forster in his novel *A Passage to India* (1924) as follows:

> They listened delighted, for they took the public view of poetry, not the private which obtains in England. It never bored them to hear words, words; they breathed them with the cool night air never stopping to analyze; the name of the poet, Hafiz, Hali, Iqbal, was sufficient guarantee (Forster 1924: 38).

This kind of enthusiasm for poetry was common. Every student of Aligarh Muslim University who has written memoirs has attested to it. And books of madrassa students, and even sermons, are studded with the couplets of the ghazal which are obviously amorous and sometimes erotic (Nadvi 2007). The highest number of publications of printed books, pamphlets, monographs, etc., during British India used to be either on literary or religious themes (Annexure A of Chapter 12). Sometimes the one theme, and sometimes the other, predominated. In short, printing flooded the market with the Urdu ghazal and reinforced the impression that Urdu was the language of love. Since the ghazal mentioned love and beauty repeatedly, Urdu itself came to be associated with romance and eroticism in the public mind. This image proved to be harmful for Urdu during the Urdu-Hindi controversy when some critics (such as Bharatendu referred to earlier) said that they did not want their children to learn Urdu as, being taught through its literature, it would spoil them. This criticism is still repeated by the partisans of the indigenous languages of Pakistan who claim that Urdu, being nurtured in the decadent and effete culture of the *nawabs* of India, is a decadent language. However, whatever critics might say, Urdu couplets and inscriptions, written on the pattern of the ghazal by unknown and often unaccomplished poets, are used widely to decorate trucks in Pakistan. They are chosen by the driver, the

painter and sometimes by the owner of the truck, generally out of scrapbooks kept for this purpose by painters. Out of all types of inscriptions on different themes—religion, fatalism, love for the mother, life of the driver, the truck itself, blessings and good wishes—romantic inscriptions are found on 56 per cent trucks from the Punjab; 50 per cent from the KP; 37 per cent from Sindh; 59 per cent from Balochistan and 51 per cent from Gilgit-Baltistan and the AJK area. At 95 per cent confidence level, there is no significant difference between these different regions of Pakistan in the occurrence of romantic inscriptions on the backs of trucks (Rahman 2010: 290).

THE DEFEAT OF EROS

The reformers crusaded against the eroticism of Urdu in ways which have been described earlier (Rahman 2002: 498–509). They won and slowly Urdu started becoming associated with Islam and Pakistani nationalism in Pakistan. In India it remains associated with the Muslim identity. But this identity can be politically-oriented or a nostalgic throwback to the Mughal past, like Nur, the failed poet in Anita Desai's novel *In Custody* (1984). In the latter case there are some fading associations with romance and beauty but hardly the erotic. However, as the madrassas teach Urdu more often than secular schools in India, even the association with romance is fading away though the ghazal is still responded to among middle-aged, educated, urban people with much nostalgic enthusiasm. Mostly, however, in India, Urdu is a matter of demands, protests and Muslim political mobilization (see Farouqui 2006). In Pakistan, it is a contested terrain—opposed by the supporters of ethnic identities as well as those of English (Rahman 1996: 228–247)—and more often viewed as part of the Islamic-Pakistani identity than the language of love and longing.

In short, the nineteenth century witnessed battles, so to speak, for the soul of Urdu. It was a period of transition and the

formation of new identities for groups of human beings (Muslims, Hindus, etc.). The Indian reformers' desire to purge the language of its erotic associations was motivated by their political agenda for the construction of a 'nation' which was respectable, serious and modern. They felt compelled to defend their culture and literature, and by extension, the whole Indian Muslim community, against the British and Hindu charge of concupiscence, decadence and lethargy of which the literature of Urdu, as known up to the reformist movement, seemed to be an obvious and painful reminder. Incidentally, a comparable movement was going on in the construction of the Modern (Sanskritized) Hindi tradition also. Here too the traditional use of Braj Bhasha, famous for songs and erotic poetry (the *Shrngrara rasā*) was being replaced by Khari Boli which was excelling in nationalistic and realistic poetry. In 1925, when a Braj poem was read out in a poetry meeting (*kavī sammēlan*) 'the small group of women heroically present in the audience walked off offended by its "vulgarity"' (Orsini 2002: 86). Here too tradition was invented and the inventors were Victorian gentlemen morbidly conscious of appearing prim, proper and respectable.

But back to the Muslims of North India. Their defence of their culture and literature went hand in hand with the ideological imperative of emphasizing the Muslim identity, which tended to push Urdu towards an Islamic orientation. As Muslim separatism needed it as a symbol of the Muslim political identity mobilized against a Hindu version of a similar but opposing identity, it took on new features of a strident nationalism which is perennial in Urdu textbooks in Pakistan. However, the new language—the older one being Persian—continued to express the medieval themes of redemption and spirituality of which the erotic was always a part.

During this period Urdu produced all of its canonical literature in poetry which is predominantly associated with love and sometimes with the erotic. Thus the different, and often

paradoxical, associations of Urdu kept in conflict with each other with the public mind responding alternately to different ones according to the demands of the situation and whether the occasion was public (when Iqbal's nationalistic and Islamic poetry was quoted) or private (when Ghalib's love odes were more appropriate). However, the public mode gained ascendancy and the amorous and erotic associations were suppressed in the wake of the political urgency and identity politics of the Pakistan movement, and then the perpetual struggle the Pakistani ruling elite waged against the ethnic elites of Pakistan on the one hand and the Western and Indian 'Other' on the other. We now live in a highly politicized age when the amorous and the erotic are tolerated far less than ever before though, ironically, it is also the age of mass production of and easy access to commercial pornography through the internet. So, although the beautiful aspects of the ghazal are moribund and still draw the ire of hardline Islamists as well as the Westernized professionals for their purported eroticism or romantic frivolities, a new generation of young people are being exposed to the commodification of the body in ways never imagined by even the most erotic poets of Urdu.

NOTES

1. The following books were found by Nusuh in his son Kaleem's room and burnt. They are mostly books of Urdu poetry, either the ghazal or erotic stories in verse. However, books other than poetry are also included.

    Kulliyāt-ē-Ātish (ghazal)

    Dīwān-ē-Sharar (ghazal)

    Vāsōkht-ē-Amānat (amorous story in verse with erotic description of female beauty)

    Fasānā-ē-Ajāēb (Prose story in highly Persianized Urdu)

    Qissā Gul Bukāōlī (amorous story in verse)

    Arāēsh-ē-Maēhfil (1801) by Sayyid Haider Baksh Haider. A tale (*dāstān*) originally said to be in Persian and rendered into ornate Urdu prose in Fort William College. Like other tales it belongs to the fantasy world of magic, adventure, romance and necromancy.

    Masnavī Mīr Hasan (amorous story)

Waqā'e-ē-Nēmat Khan Alī. The author's full name is Nuruddin Muhammad Shirazi (d. 1710–1711). The book is in Persian and it describes the victory of Bahadur Shah, son of Aurangzeb, over Golconda (Hyderabad) in 1687.

Ghazliāt-ē-Chirkīn (scabrous poetry)

Hazliāt-ē-Jā'far Zatallī (satirical and indecent verse)

Qasāēd-ē-Hajviā Mirzā Rafi Saudā (satirical and highly polemical verse)

Dīvān-ē-Jān-Sahib (*Rēkhtī* poetry)

Indar Sabhā (amorous drama with descriptions of female beauty)

Divān Nazīr Akbarābādī (with couplets of Mian Hud Hud) (some poems are erotic)

Vāsōkht (the author is not specified but all poems of this genre are amorous and erotic)

Kulliyāt-ē-Rind (mostly ghazal) (Ahmed 2004: 406–407).

Hameed Naseem, describing the informal reading material during his childhood much later in the twentieth century, mentions the following books: in Persian *Naērang-ē-Ishq* of Ghanimat Kunjahi and *Yusuf Zuleikha* of Jami. And in Urdu the poetic works of Zauq, Dagh, Hali, Atish, Nasikh and Shah Naseer. He describes the Persian work *Bahār-ē-Dānish* as a unique classic of erotic writing (Naseem 1990: 31).

2. European translators of the *Masnavī* were so embarrassed by the erotic content of some of the fables that Nicholson who translated it in English between 1925 to 1940 rendered them (133 out of 25, 700 couplets) in Latin so that only a few scholars could have access to them. He considered them 'too outspoken for our taste' but now that they are no longer unsuitable for Europe they are not acceptable in Pakistan. Even in 1956, when the Pakistani scholar Afzal Iqbal started writing his book on Rumi he was anxious to defend Rumi on the possible charge of sensuality (see Iqbal 1956: 284–314).

3. Syeda Jafer does not accept 1022/1613 as the date of writing this book and claims that internal evidence suggests that the poet lived sometime in 1201/1786 to 1209/1794–95 (Jafer in Jafer and Jain Vol. 2, 1998: 424–433).

8

The British and Hindustani

While Indians spoke and wrote in Urdu-Hindi before the arrival of the British, they did not use the language in the formal domains of power on any big scale. Thus the first rulers to use Hindustani (Urdu-Hindi), Urdu as well as Hindi, in several formal domains of power, were the British. In doing so they disseminated knowledge of the languages almost all over India, printed texts in them, created discourses in them for public consumption in the media, and helped standardize them. Indeed, the political and social history of Urdu (as well as Hindi) is connected with British rule in ways which must be understood in order to gain insights into why this common language became an all-India presence and how it came to be split into two rival standardized languages (Urdu and Hindi) and how identity and communal politics in British India, and even after British rule came to an end, is so intimately linked with these two languages.

This chapter, therefore, seeks to explore how the British learned Hindustani, commissioned writings in it and wrote about it. Even more interestingly, how the language became a symbol of identity of the old India hands or British officers who had returned home after having served in India. Thus the literature of Anglo-India (used here in the earlier sense for the British in India and not for those born of marriages between Europeans and Indians as it came to be understood later) is full of words from Hindustani (also called Urdu by some British authors).[1] Rudyard Kipling (1865–1936) can hardly be enjoyed unless one is provided with a glossary of these words and even then the

authenticity of the experience of the *raj* is lost in the translation and the interpretation.

That Hindustani was an identity marker for the British in India is borne out by a number of sources. According to Ivor Lewis, author of a dictionary of Anglo-Indian words:

> They [the Hindustani words] could not have been much used except (with fading relevance) among a declining number of retired Anglo-Indians in the evening of their lives spent in their salubrious English *compounds* and *cantonments*. They brought with them into retirement their old imperial India colonized in their old imperial hearts, with a small but, to them, vivid vocabulary of Anglo-Indian words, such as I have quoted above, which set them apart from their stay-at-home neighbours (Lewis 1991: 11).

There are many examples of the use of Hindustani words in English speech from British writers—even those like Sir Walter Scott (*The Surgeon's Daughter*, 1827), who had never been to India. Others who were acclaimed writers on India made it a distinctive feature of their portrayal of the British who had lived in India. Some of the more well-known works in this genre, apart from Kipling, are by: William Makepeace Thackeray (1811–63); E.M. Forster (1879–1970); William Knighton (1885); Edward Thomson (1886–1946) and Edmund Candler (1874–1926); Flora Annie Steel (1847–1927); Maud Diver (1867–1945); Alice Perrin (1867–1934) and Christine Weston (1904–1989) among others. The present day hunger for nostalgic *raj* stories is fulfilled by P.M. Scott's (1920–1978) *The Raj Quartet* (1966–1975) to name only the best sellers. All of these writers portray characters whose speech becomes colourful, authentic, or outlandish by the use of Hindustani words in it. It is as if one cannot create the distinctively exotic atmosphere of India if one does not use these Hindustani words.

However, Hindustani was not learned primarily to serve as an identity marker of past greatness or evidence of having lived an

exotic, adventurous and even a heroic life. It was learned as a tool of imperialism; quite literally as a language of command. The classic work on this is Bernard Cohn's influential article which argues that the British learned the vernacular languages, mostly Hindustani, to understand Indians better so as to rule them more efficiently. It was, more than any other language, 'the language of command' (Cohn 1985). It was the mark of the *pukkā* sahib (the authentic master).

An Englishman, like Kipling's Legal Member in the short story 'Tod's Amendment', whose 'knowledge of natives was limited to English-speaking Durbaris, and his own red *chaprassis*', knew no Hindustani and needed the boy Tod's advice to make a popular law for the Indians (Kipling 1896: 185). It was also needed by the British women if only to order their servants, and by the children in order to play with Indian children and get the attention of their servants. Moreover, it was all around them even in areas where it was not the local language because the British used it in the army and with their servants. Thus, even without formal instruction, it was picked up by the British. But it was also taught formally and this is what is described below. But first, let us place this language-learning in a theoretical perspective.

The grammar and dialogue books, written by the British to learn Hindustani, have received excellent scholarly analysis by Richard Steadman-Jones. His arguments are that, apart from the well-known motive of learning the language in order to facilitate colonial control (Cohn 1985), the act of using the language involved an element of risk. Thus, at the psychological level, 'a sense of danger and disquiet really were central to colonial language learning' (Steadman-Jones 2007: 45). In short, language-learning was an act of representation—that of the colonial power in the abstract and that of the individual learner in the concrete. However, there appear to be two traditions of writing the pedagogical materials which are described below. There is the work of George Hadley, an army officer, who chooses to call the

language 'Moors', while Gilchrist calls it 'Hindustani'. For Hadley, this 'pejorative labelling' reduces it to 'trade jargons' (Steadman-Jones 2007: 52), while Gilchrist raises its status 'by showing that it was not indeed a 'jargon' but a proper 'language', with standards of correctness that needed to be taken seriously' (Ibid., 56–57). According to Steadman-Jones, Gilchrist raised the worth of Hindustani to 'render the language available for appropriation', so the British could understand 'the risks inherent in speaking a language badly' (Ibid., 260). The opposing trend, as exemplified in the works of Hadley, was to 'insist that the problem lay in the language and not in the colonial agent's own grasp of it [which] can be understood as a strategy of self-preservation through which feelings of anxiety and vulnerability were projected onto the colonized other and not attributed to the colonizing self' (Steadman-Jones 2007: 261). To this, the present writer would like to add that sometimes speaking badly showed a triumphant ignorance of the language of the colonized because it showed not lack of something, but was a boast that one did not have to speak the tongue of the ruled perfectly. All these attitudes are in evidence in the history of the teaching and learning of Hindustani by the British in India.

First, it was taught to young British officers who came to India. This necessitated the writing of grammars and textbooks—especially textbooks in prose. That is how modern Urdu prose was created. There are many accounts of the man who presided over the birth of modern Urdu prose, John B. Gilchrist (Kidwai 1972; Siddiqi 1963; 1979; Lelyveld 1993). The most sophisticated of these is Steadman-Jones's study of the work of Gilchrist, since it places them in the context of the situation in India, as well as the grammatical traditions of Europe (Steadman-Jones 2007). Gilchrist arrived in India is 1782 and started learning Hindustani. In 1785 he took leave for a year to collect material for a grammar book and dictionary of Hindustani. In 1786 the first, and in 1796 the second, parts of his dictionary were published. In the same

year he published a grammar of Hindustani also. In 1799 he established a seminary to teach Hindustani and Persian to junior civil servants in Calcutta, and in 1800 he was appointed professor of Hindustani at Fort William College. At Fort William he commissioned Meer Amman Dehlvi (d. 1806?) (Akhtar 1992: 423–427) to write the prose tale *Bāgh-ō-Bahār* (1801), which was then used for teaching the language to several generations of British officers and Indians. There are also several accounts of the Fort William College, often called the birthplace of both, modern Urdu prose as well as Modern (Sanskritized) Hindi (Fort William 1801; Public 1811; Roebuck 1819). A very readable account, Sisir Kumar Das's *Sahibs and Munshis* (Das 1978), remains the most accessible for the general reader. Less well-known are accounts of the Haileybury College and the language-teaching either proposed or actually carried out there. T.R. Malthus proposed the establishment of a college for 'some instruction in the rudiments of the oriental languages' (Malthus 1817: 43) though the teaching was rudimentary at best. The names of some of the teachers of Urdu in this college and the military seminary at Addiscombe have, however, been given by Fisher (2004) in the context of tracing out the lives and occupations of Indians who settled in Britain before the twentieth century.

There are many accounts of the British experience of learning Hindustani in biographies and letters. A notable account, written by Rafiuddin Ahmed (1865–1954), a friend of Queen Victoria's Hindustani teacher Munshi Abdul Karim and aspirant to the British parliament, is an indicator of the symbolic significance of the language in the mind of the Queen (Ahmad 1891). In my book sub-titled 'language-learning among the Muslims of Pakistan and North India', there is a brief account (four pages) of the learning of Urdu by the British (Rahman 2002: 212–215). None of these accounts look at the British perceptions of the language. nor do they describe the way the British officers learned the language, nor their levels of proficiency or the

relationship between their use of it and power. Some accounts do, however, describe some of the texts, such as Meer Amman's *Bāgh-ō-Bahār*, which was taught to the British officers at Fort William (Duncan Forbes's 'Preface to the Edition of 1846' in Akhtar 1992: 267–270). But this is a fairly advanced literary text. The basics of the language itself were taught through grammars, manuals and phrase books which have not been described in any scholarly work in the detail they deserve. This chapter is an attempt to fill that gap. It also relates the learning of this language by the British to their perceptions of identity—both theirs and of the Indians—and power: the fact of British rule over India. These perceptions constructed a linguistic category and fed into certain identity constructions going on during colonial rule. These constructions and their relationship with power and identity are traced out below.

INSTRUCTION AND EVALUATION

In British educational institutions, the teaching of Hindustani was through the grammar-translation method. Evaluation was through formal examinations as well as oral performances. The latter, called public disputations, were held at Fort William College in which subjects related to the language, or its wider significance, were discussed. The one held in 1814 was: 'The Hindoostanee language, from its various origin and composition, is calculated to be more copious than any other language current in India'. This was opposed and there was a moderator too (Disputation 1814:17).

The questions required knowledge of both the Urdu and the Devanagari scripts, and grammar as well as translation were emphasized. For instance, the Hindustani examination held on 23 June 1801 at Fort William College, the first such examination to be held, has the following questions among others:

1. Decline the second personal pronoun [of Hindustani].

2. Translate the following passage in Nagri and Persian scripts.

In another examination, held on the 24 June, Mirza Ali Lutf's 'ghazal' in Rekhta, in the Urdu script, are set up for examination (Exercises 1802). On the whole the questions tend to direct the students to study works by Muslims which are now included among the classics of Urdu. Meer Amman, of course, was a great favourite of examiners. But the list of publications of 1819 reveals far more works in Urdu in the Perso-Arabic script than in Hindi in the Devanagari script. For instance there is Mir Taqi Mir's work 'composed chiefly in the Oordoo, or Hindoostanee language' (Roebuck 1819: 286). Then there is 'Gul Bakaoli' written by 'Meer Buhadoor Ulee' (Mir Bahadur Ali) in 1803 under the direction of Gilchrist; Sueyid Huedur Bukhsh Hueduree's (Sayid Haider Baksh Haideri) *Tōtā Kahānī* (1804); Meer Husun's Masnavi *Sahr-ul-Bayān*; *Ikhwān-us-Safā* translated from the Arabic by Muolvee Ikram Ulee (Maulvi Ikram Ali) in 1811 (Roebuck 1819). This is in conformity with the British perception of Hindustani as easy Urdu. Sanskritized Hindi, also patronized by the British at Fort William through the works of Lalluji Lal and Sadal Misra, was probably a reaction of the majority community (the Hindus) to this British partiality for Urdu and its script.

The institutions for teaching the British were the colleges— such as Fort William in Calcutta and Haileybury in England—but before they were established, young officers learned Hindustani from teachers (Munshis). This was hardly a pleasant encounter since the young British officers were arrogant and often rode roughshod over the sensibilities of their instructors as Bayly has brought out (Bayly 1996: 74–75). In 1799, some junior civil servants were ordered to attend a course in Hindustani by Gilchrist. Indeed, the Court of Directors was not in favour of establishing Fort William College but it did want Gilchrist's experimental seminary to be revived. Lord Wellesley's reasons

for establishing the college were that the East India Company ruled vast territories and its officers could 'no longer be considered as the agents of a COMMERCIAL CONCERN; they are in fact the ministers and officers of a POWERFUL SOVEREIGN' (Wellesley's Minute in Council at Fort William, 18 Aug 1800 in Public 1811: 14). He goes on to argue that no establishment in England could give a correct knowledge of 'the languages, laws, and customs of India'... as even Sir William Jones was not intelligible to the natives of India when he first arrived at Calcutta. However, the Directors replied that their permission had not been obtained and that they were financially constrained so the college could not be allowed to function. They did, however, ask Wellesley to re-establish a seminary to teach Hindustani as proposed by Gilchrist in 1798 (Public 1811: 60).

Wellesley replied (5 Aug 1802) that there was no scarcity of money (the estimate of 1802–3 being 4 *lacs*) and if so many languages are taught in all the presidencies separately, the expenses will be more than if they are taught in one place. Hindustani, he agreed, was common to all the presidencies, but the local languages were different. As for Gilchrist, he said that he taught the grammar of Hindustani (Public 1811: 67–81) and so he was to be employed (Ibid., 82). However, as Calcutta also had 'learned natives' already employed for teaching the language, it would be seen as 'manifest injustice' if they were dismissed (Ibid., 107). At last the Directors relented and professorships in languages, including 'Hindustanee', were established. In time, however, political imperatives made Hindustani a more rational choice than Persian. One reason could be that the formal, ornate Persian prose used for writing letters and documents made the British so dependent upon their Munshis that it was more profitable to 'expand the use of English and Hindustani in official business after 1837' (Bayly 1996: 144). So, for many reasons including political ones, the shift towards Hindustani began before Persian was finally removed.

Languages were also taught at the Haileybury College in England since this college was meant to cater for the requirements of aspiring young civil servants in India.

> Within the age of 18 or 19, with some instruction in the rudiments of the Oriental languages; and the Indian establishment to be confined exclusively to these languages, and particularly to act as a final test, as far as languages go, of qualification for office (Malthus 1817: 43–44).

In Haileybury, Hindustani was not taught initially (1806) but on 18 December 1813, the Librarian addressed the Committee of the College concerning students who had borrowed Shakespeare's Hindoostanee Grammar. Then a certain J. Michael requested the College (Petition of 14 Dec 1829) to buy his reprinted and amended edition of *Bāgh ō Bahār* and *Ikhwān us Suffā.* On 28 December 1828 C. Wilkins authorized another book of Hindustani and the same person gave reports to the College about the proficiency of students which was not very great considering that the award of 'Great Proficiency' was very rare indeed (Hertford: no page).

Up to 1814 there was no examination in the Oriental languages so hardly anybody took them seriously (Fisher 2004: 124). However, some of the Indian teachers had successful careers teaching Urdu. One such person, Syed Abdoollah (Abdullah) (b. 1825), reached Britain and applied for an appointment as 'Moonshee or Teacher of the Persian, Oordoo, and Hindee languages' at Haileybury or Addiscombe (Ibid., 424). He later taught for two years at Hanwell College and also at Grove, Blackheath. He is described as a 'Teacher of Hindustanee' (Ibid., 425). Later, he became Professor of Hindustani at University College, London, and remained there from 1859 to 1866. Another gentleman, D.K. Shahabuddin, is also described as a Professor of Hindustani, Gujarati and Marathi. However, the salaries of Indians were lower than those of Englishmen and they often took

private tuitions (Ibid., 427). Some were only private tutors. For instance, Mirza Muhammad Fitrat of Lucknow, advertised himself in 1801 as a teacher of Persian, Arabic 'and also the Arabic and Hindostanee Languages as Pronounced in the Country' (Fisher 2004: 105). As Indian sailors also lived in some parts of London, those who frequently came into contact with them learnt a few words of Hindustani. Sometimes, when the sailors were taken to the police, the people who had learnt English from them turned up as interpreters (Salter 1873: 26–27 quoted from Fisher 2004: 390). Exactly what kind of Hindustani was learned by the English in England is not documented. However, the kind of English they learned in India, or to use in India, is documented and exemplifies the linguistic aspects of the exercise of power.

HINDUSTANI IN THE IMPERATIVE MODE

The 'oldest grammar' of the language called Hindustani was written by the Dutch Director of the Dutch East India Company, Jean Josua Ketelaar, in 1698 (Bhatia and Kzuhiko 2008). Ketelaar's real name was Kettler and he was born in Elbing (Germany) in 1659. He served the East India Company at Surat in 1683 and by 1708 he was 'senior merchant' because of his 'expertise in the "Moorish" language' (Bhatia and Kzuhiko 2008: 26). He wrote this grammar book in Agra, when given the charge of the Dutch factory there in 1700 (Ibid., 27). The Hindustani words are given in the Roman script while the explanation is in Dutch. The first grammar in which the words are in the Perso-Arabic script is by Benjamin Shultz (1689–1760). This was completed on 30 June 1741 and published in Leipzig as *Die Schultzi Grammatica Hindostanica in 1748* (MS. or quort 161 in Staatsbibliothek, Berlin described by Zaidi 1973: xi). Here the explanation is in Latin.

The British learned Hindustani to command their subordinates in the office, servants at home and subjects all over the subcontinent. As such, language was one of the sites for the exercise of power. There are two models of language-teaching

available during the British period. The first may be called the Hadlean (from George Hadley) and the second the Gilchrist (from J.B. Gilchrist) model.

To take Hadley's model first, we notice that the sentences are in the imperative form and very rude. Whether this is so because, as Bayly says, 'Hindustani was a language with which to marshal the lowly servant and sepoy' (Bayly 1996: 288) or because Hadley, being a soldier, and writing for his colleagues did not care about niceties, or because he was an arrogant man is not clear. The fact remains that his tone and examples are extremely ill-mannered. First, the royal 'we' is used for one's own self (*ham*) but the other person is always addressed with the less polite '*tum*' instead of the polite '*āp*'.

Toom hum ko sunta?	You (to) me hear
Chourah mooh sa bole	Loud (with a broad mouth) speak.
Kone hy chorow	Who's there, boy?
Hum ghoorau pur churinga	We will mount the horse (Hadley 1809: 6–15).

Not only are these orders rude but they are also grammatically incorrect. There are mistakes in use of the verb (*suntē hō* would be correct); adjective (*ūchā* not '*Chourah mooh*', and nouns (*laṛkā* or *chōkrā* not *choorau*; *ghōṛ ā* not *ghoorau*).

Hadley arrived in Calcutta as a subaltern in 1763 and may have been more abrupt and imperative than others. He is not averse to using swear words (*harrām zāddāh* = bastard) (Hadley 1772: 132–133). It seems that his understanding of the language, or at least that which he wrote, was restricted to passing orders to servants.

Arnot and Forbes, writing in the same paradigm, concede that this Moors is essentially the jargon of servants and masters and not useful for communicating with 'the higher classes of natives' (Arnot and Forbes 1828: ii–iv). This book gives a short section on salutations in which the recommended reply to all salutations

for inferiors is merely '*salām*'. Even here, so little is the author's understanding of Indian etiquette, that he tells English people to tell Indian visitors to cut short their visit if they stay too long. He believes that they should not offend their visitors by saying: '*Toom Ja'o* = you go!' Instead, they should use the politer formula, '*ub rookhsut leeje* = be pleased to take your leave' (Ibid., 476). He does not understand how offensive this must be for the visitors. He also points out that the 'natives' do not have a synonym for 'thank you'; but fails to add that there are phrases which convey the same meaning (Ibid., 479). Another writer of this period, John Shakespear, whose books are mentioned in the reading lists for students, gives exercises in the Roman, Perso-Arabic as well as the Devanagari scripts, giving samples of conversation between an Englishman (Sahib) and his teacher (Munshi). Here, contrary to the Indian norms of addressing one's teacher, the Sahib always uses '*tum*' for the Munshi while the latter uses '*āp*' (Shakespear 1840: 29).

By the early twentieth century, when the Indians were awakening politically, there was some attempt at linguistic politeness. Thus, I.A. Shah, after giving sentences for inferiors with '*tum*' and people of high social standing with '*āp*', mentions that 'it is always advisable to use "*āp*"' (Shah 1918: 78). This advice, however, was not usually followed as samples of conversation from this era suggest.

Another characteristic of the ordinary instructional books is to make Hindustani as easy as possible. This is understandable since conversation with servants and subordinates did not require the extensive vocabulary which is required for urbane or learned discourse. Thus, perhaps in order to find the lowest common denominator in vocabulary, some British writers would dismiss all learned words. Phillott, the author of the *Hindustani Manual* (1913), claims to have tested all words and phrases with an illiterate Punjabi bearer from the Murree Hills and rejected all which he did not understand (Phillott 1913: v).

Similarly, in the *Urdū Rōznāmā* (1911) he claims:

> The vocabulary of all these parts is the everyday vocabulary of the
> uneducated; it is believed that very few words will be found in the
> text that are not in some form or other used by the uneducated
> Muslims of Delhi, Lucknow, Behar etc. etc (Phillott 1911: 1).

At the other end, however, are practitioners of the Gilchrist
model which considered Hindustani a proper language and not
merely a servant-master pidgin language. John Gilchrist's own *A
Grammar of the Hindoostanee Language* (1796) quotes Urdu poets
like Sauda, Wali and Meer Hasan.

But whatever the extent of the knowledge of people like
Gilchrist, the ordinary Englishman in India was a *'kōī Haē'* (a term
used for shouting for servants meaning: 'is anybody there?'). The
caricature of an English gentleman, sometimes called 'Colonel
Poona' as by the radio broadcaster and director, Z.A. Bukhari,
was probably the norm (Bukhari 1966: 289). Bukhari, like many
others, remarks that the Hindustani spoken by English people
was a testament to the listener's will and ability to understand
rather than the speaker's proficiency in the spoken language
(Bukhari 1966: 77). A contemporary of Bukhari, Lionel Fielden,
the Director General of the All India Radio, says with great
candour and humility, 'with infernal cheek and of my own free
will, I went to India to place myself at the head of a cultural
organization in a country whose history I scarcely knew, not one
of whose two hundred languages I had mastered' (Fielden 1960:
154). But Fielden had tried to learn Hindustani as he says:

> In England I had plodded through a whole Hindustani grammar, and
> knew by heart every exercise in it: how much is it, I should like a
> bath now, bring me some tea, how is your grandfather? More, indeed
> much more, I had learned to read and write the printed Urdu script
> (Fielden 1960: 165).

However, many Englishmen were so weak in Hindustani that during Bahadur Shah Zafar's trial, although the proceedings were to be held in Hindustani 'none of the five judges—all army officers of relatively junior rank—proved to be fluent in that language' (Dalrymple 2006: 436). The president, however, was the only one familiar with it (Ibid., 436). Even Ralph Russell, now famous as a scholar of Urdu, says that during his stay of three and a half years in India, his proficiency in the language left much to be desired (Russell 1996: 7–8).

Besides not conjugating the verbs correctly, Englishmen used the imperative form either because they were taught that most often—we have seen how exercises in books used to teach Englishmen the imperative form—or because they were careless about polite usage, even when they were aware of it. Dennis Kincaid, in his history of British social life in India, describes how in the evening 'the gentlemen soon exhausted their stock of Hindustani abuse, which was small, so small indeed that from constantly hearing the words repeated the ladies picked up certain indecorous phrases—particularly "Jow Jehannum"... which was a favourite expletive with the gentlemen' (Kincaid 1938: 163).

An insightful observation in this context is from E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India* (1924). In the novel, Mrs Turton, the Collector's wife invites 'native' women to a party.

> Advancing, she shook hands with the group and said a few words of welcome in Urdu. She had learned the lingo, but only to speak to her servants, so she knew none of the politer forms, and of the verbs only the imperative mode (Forster 1924: 61–62).

Mrs Turton obviously belonged to that version of the Hadleyan tradition of language-learning which was too arrogant to imagine that the British needed to speak Hindustani properly.

So, despite Steadman-Jones's theory about linguistic anxiety among the British, I would contend that this must have been

confined to the highest British officials or persons appointed to posts where such knowledge was a source of pride and distinction (like Gilchrist's own post), but ordinary English people in India—secure in their knowledge of imperial power and racial superiority—deliberately made linguistic mistakes to show their contempt for the native language.

CODE-SWITCHING AMONG OLD INDIA HANDS

Another feature of British linguistic usage in India was code switching—the use of Hindustani words in English conversation and vice versa. This is a feature of South Asians speaking English even now but the British used the typically imperative forms even on such occasions. A number of such conversations are recorded in Anglo-Indian fiction. Letters and diaries also have some Hindustani words but only those ones which, presumably, have no exact English equivalent. To begin with there are the Portuguese words (*ayāh*=nurse; cobra= a kind of snake; palanquin= covered litter; *chābī*= key; peon= errand boy). These were absorbed in Anglo-Indian English and made it different from British English. The best source for this mixed language, very similar to the mixing of Persian with Hindi to produce what has been called Rekhta, are the records of the English factories in India. These are available from 1616 onwards. Interestingly the word used for Hindi-Urdu in these records is Indostan. The term 'Mosselmana' is used in a document of 10 February 1623, but the note explaining this usage says this may be either Persian or Hindustani (Foster 1908: 196). However, samples from what is called 'Indostan' are scattered all over the records and the language is named as in the case which follows. A certain John Willougby, writing to the Surat Factory on 5 August 1623, reports how a factory officer found some natives digging 'And hee having no Indeston to speake to them, hee returned presenly [sic] to me...' (Foster 1908: 253). Yet another term which is used is 'Banian' and the person who is said to speak it is 'Santidas, the

great Banian' who is 'very powerfull at court' (Foster 1911: 259). But it is not clear what language this was in 1636.

The records of the factories are full of words now clearly recognizable as Urdu-Hindi and they are so liberally used as to create a new hybrid language which may be called Hinglish. The writers use not only individual words but also proverbs. For instance, Willougby, whom we have met earlier, writes of the Gujaratis on 30 July 1623: 'Thereof they say to the Guzz[er]ats pilla latte and pecher botte', i.e. first kick them and then speak to them (Foster 1908: 251). Another sample is Robert Hughes at Patna's letter to the Factors at Agra on 31 March 1621 describing a great fire:

> A tirable fier kindled, which havinge consumed al those partes, by the fource of a stronge ondye, brake into the citte and within the space of two greese came into the verye harte thereof, where our aboade is; whoe being environed with neigboringe choperes (Foster 1906: 247).

In this sample all the words have English equivalents: *ondye* [*ā̃dhī*]=hurricane; *grees* [*gha̤rīs*]=unit of time; *choperes* [*chappar*]= thatched huts. But these words are being used because they are part of the natural vocabulary of the users.

Thus, apart from using words for which there was no exact equivalent, some Anglo-Indians used Hindustani words as an identity symbol which has been referred to in the beginning of this chapter. Apart from the actual usage of the factory records mentioned above, there are examples of this from literature which, albeit caricatures, do give some idea of how much Hindustani had permeated British speech in India.

> *Decko*, you want this *admi abhi*, but you ain't goin' to get 'im. *Tumhara nahin.* He's mine, *mehra admi, sumja*? If you want to *lurro*, come on (Steel, *Voices in the Night,* 1900 in Lewis 1991: 12).

(*Decko* is *dēkhō*= see; *ādmī*= man; *abhī*=just now; *tumhārā*=yours; *nahĩ* = not; *mehra mērā*= mine; *sumja* is *sumjhē*= do you understand [*sumjhā* is the impolite form which does not go with *tumhārā*]; *luṛṛō*= to fight).

While this is a caricature, old India hands did use many Hindustani words which they had become accustomed to. Some did have English equivalents, though perhaps not with the same shade of meaning, while others were irreplaceable. The British contact with India left a permanent mark on the vocabulary of English, including Portuguese words used by the British in India, as the dictionaries affirm (Yule and Burnell 1903; Lewis 1991). It is because of this contact, stretching over two centuries, between India and Britain, that many English words have entered Indian languages while words in Indian languages, especially Hindustani, are found in English. This may be the most enduring legacy of this contact.

THE LEARNING OF HINDUSTANI BY BRITISH MEN

There are several caricatures of British officers who learned 'Hindustani' but only to pass examinations. In a novel about this period, there is a hypothetical Secretary who 'though he could never speak an intelligible sentence in the language, he had such a practical and useful knowledge of it, in half-a-dozen of its dialects, that he could pass examinations in it with the highest credit, netting immense rewards' (Quoted from Kincaid 1938: 247). However, the fact is that knowledge of the language varied enormously among the British, though most probably never went beyond the imperative phase mentioned earlier. The early British arrivals in India learned Hindustani privately with the help of Munshis. Later, although the Munshis were not entirely dispensed with, educational institutions arranged for tutors. Some came in contact with the language even before leaving the British shore. This is because Hindustani was taught, as was Persian, at Haileybury. John Beames, an eminent civil servant

who studied there, said 'Haileybury was a happy place, though rather a farce as far as learning was concerned' (Beames 1961: 63). He adds that no attempt was made 'to practice talking with them or to acquire any practical familiarity with them' (Ibid., 64). In his case, when he came to Calcutta, he had to hire a Munshi (Hari Prasad Dutt) to learn Hindustani and Persian to pass an examination. The examination was held every month and he passed in the fourth month (Beames 1961: 81). However, he did not approve of teaching young officers languages in Calcutta. According to him:

> As to languages, which were the pretext for keeping us in Calcutta, I can honestly say that I knew very little more about them at the end of the eleven months than I did at the beginning (Beames 1961: 91).

He learned Punjabi by talking to a Sikh priest who simply translated books into Hindustani. This language was necessary for talking to the 'peasantry and lower classes in town only' as 'the upper classes and educated people spoke Hindustani' (Ibid., 101). Lionel Fielden writes in his journal (27 August 1935) that 'Cornelia Sorabji examines me in Urdu, which (if I knew it) is rather like a Greek examining an American in French' (Fielden 1960: 152). However, he kept slogging through 'lessons in Urdu' throughout his stay in India (Ibid., 188).

The military cadets were also taught some Hindustani in England, though perhaps only for a short time. In 1809, the Military Seminary at Adiscombe near Croydon was established. In 1804 a school was set up at Baraset near Calcutta to teach the Indian languages but it was closed down in 1811. The cadets were, however, studying Hindustani—the only Indian language they studied—in 1813. In 1861 this facility was sold and cadets started attending Woolwich and Sandhurst. Among the professors of Hindustani the following are mentioned: John Shakespear (1809–1829); Richard Haughton (1821–1851); Charles Bowles (1829–1859); Maj. Michael John Rowlandson (1851–1861) and

Cotton Mather (1859–1861). An Indian teacher, the equivalent of a Munshi, Hasan Ali, was also employed between 1810 and 1816. The cadets were even less willing pupils than the civil servants. Thus they must have turned up in India with almost no knowledge of Hindustani.

The military officers were, however, examined in Hindustani so they had to learn it somehow. Lieutenant Bruce Hay writes to his father from Landi Kotal:

> The Quartermaster's clerk of the 9th Gurkhas is teaching me Urdu now. I've had him about a week so far and hope to go up for the lower standard the next exam in Peshawar—the beginning of October (Hay 19 July 1898).

He gives details of the course and how the officers approached their language learning exercise.

> I've had an awful blow! In the Bagh-o-Bahar, which is the book (part) we have to do for the Urdu Lower Standard, I found out about four days ago I had been doing entirely the wrong show—having trusted the Munshi—and now, if I want to get the other beastly part finished I shall have to neglect 'Urzis' and conversation, so that you probably won't see my name amongst the successful ones! (Hay 6 September 1898).

This particular officer says he did four to five hours daily of Urdu and that in the examination, conducted by his former captain, he got 'good' for conversation, 'good' for *'Urzī'*, 'tolerable' for *Bāgh-ō-Bahār* which was 'very hard' (4 October 1898). Even so, he failed 'in that beastly Urdu Exam, and was a bit sick' when he heard that. But he tells his father by way of mitigation that only '*seven* fellows in whole of the Punjab passed, *six* of whom are on the staff!' (22 November 1898). This suggests that the standards were stringent but, in fact, as mentioned earlier, most of British officers never passed beyond the imperative mode and understanding the simplest of conversations. There were, however,

exceptions who learned Hindustani very well indeed. For instance, a certain blue-eyed European, disguised as a Faqir, 'had acquired a thorough knowledge of Sanskrit and Urdu, that no one could detect him in his speech' (Dalrymple 2006: 205). It seems, however, that the Indians were not particularly encouraging towards the British when they endeavoured to learn Hindustani. Lionel Fielden, at least, writes that his 'attempts to speak Urdu and eat Indian food' were regarded as 'a sly form of hypocrisy' (Fielden 1960: 179).

LEARNING OF HINDUSTANI BY BRITISH WOMEN

English Women also had to learn Hindustani. The most eminent example is that of Queen Victoria herself who, in keeping with her status of being the Empress of India, learned basic Hindustani from her Indian teacher, Munshi Abdul Karim (1863–1909) who was sent to her as a 'gift' and rose from the position of a waiter to that of teacher (Munshi), and who was also her favourite, and eventually, acquired the title of her Indian Secretary (Anand 1996). Among the first descriptions of the Queen's diaries, which are exercise books having simple sentences of Hindustani, written in the Perso-Arabic script, are essays by Rafiuddin Ahmad, a contemporary who knew Munshi Abdul Karim (Ahmad 1892).[2] Fanny Parkes, who lived in India between 1822 and 1846, was the wife of a minor civil servant. She enjoyed travelling all over India and was sympathetic to Indians. While coming to India she writes on 11 October 1822.

> Monsieur mon mari, who was studying Persian, began to teach me Hindustani, which afforded me much pleasure (Parkes 1850: 7).

While the husband (*Monsieur Mon Mari*) does not seem to have made any remarkable progress in any language, Fanny learnt Urdu very well. To begin with, she had to learn the language purely for instrumental reasons which she describes as follows:

> It appeared curious to be surrounded by servants who, with the exception of the tailor, could not speak one word of English; and I was forced to learn to speak Hindustani (Parkes 1850: 16).

Later, as she mingled more and more with Indians, she found the language an asset to participate in the aesthetic experiences India had to offer. Thus she mentions a gathering of Europeans—possibly the last remnants of the 'White Mughals' (Dalrymple 2003)— who were watching a dance (*nāch*) and listening to music in Hindustani. Despite considerable fluency, her grammar is as wrong as that of other English people. For instance, she sends a seal with the following motto on it:

> *Toom ghee ka dhye jalāo* (i.e. be happy and celebrate) (Ibid., 47).

Actually it should be:

> *Tum ghī kē diyē jalāō*

Hindustani was so widespread that Fanny Parkes reports its being used by the Marathas. They listened, and played, Hindustani 'airs on the *sitar*' (Parkes 1850: 262). Parkes herself was proficient enough in idiomatic Hindustani to use a proverb to reconcile the Rani of Gwalior to expulsion from her former state:

> I hesitated; the Bāī looked at me for an answer. Dropping the eyes of perplexity on the folded hands of despondency, I replied to the Brija, who had asked the question, '*jiska lāthī ooska bhains*', i.e. 'He who has the stick, his is the buffalo'!. The effect was electric. The Bāiza Bāī and the Gaja Rājā laughed, and I believe the odd and absurd application of the proverb half reconciled the Mahārāj to her fate (Parkes 1850: 265).

She was the interpreter of the Miss Edens with the former Maratha rulers (Ibid., 203). And, indeed, the Rani of Gwalior, Her

Highness the Baiza Bai, wrote a letter (_Kharītā_) to Fanny Parkes on 29 June 1838. Which she describes as follows:

> The letter was written in Urdū (the court language), in the Persian character, by one of Her Highness's _moonshees_, and signed by the Bāī herself: the paper is adorned with gold devices (Ibid., 328).

It is significant that Fanny calls it Urdu, not Hindustani, and that this language is used by a Maratha princely house.

A contemporary, Isabella Fane, daughter of General Sir Henry Fane, C-in-C of the Indian Army between 1835 and 1838, learned Hindustani but was 'too imperfect in the language to go beyond asking for what we want, and as for understanding what they say, it is quite out of the question' (Pemble 1985: 71). Like the men, she also shouts for attendants with 'qui hi!' (_Kōī Haē_) (Pemble 1985: 102). Her Hindustani, like many other women's, never went beyond the imperative mode of E.M. Forster's character, Mrs Turton.

THE LEARNING OF HINDUSTANI BY BRITISH CHILDREN

The children of the officers also acquired Hindustani as their memoirs testify. The children learned the language through the servants and sometimes became as fluent in it as to use it as a mother-tongue or their first language.

Gillian Owen, whose father arrived in India in 1918, says:

> My parents were vague, unimportant, rarely seen and vaguely threatening, figures who could not speak my language—for I remember consciously translating into English when I was with them (Fleming Vol. 2, 2004: 39).

This must have been exceptional. However, most children were fluent and flexible, i.e. they could switch between languages with ease, though, as was common in British India, they spoke

incorrect Hindustani in the imperative mode. Blake Pinnell, whose father arrived in India in 1920, reports:

> Martin and I talked in Hindustani to the Indian servants and probably spoke as much in that language as we did in English. No one gave us lessons in Hindustani: I suppose we learned it by listening. Whether what we said was strictly grammatical, I shall never know, but at least we communicated effectively. Later on, we learned that there was a brand of Hindustani known as 'kitchen Hindi' which the *memsahib* or the lady of the house used when speaking to her servants, and maybe we had picked up a bit of that (Ibid., Vol. 1: 247).

Indeed, almost all British India picked up a bit of the 'Kitchen Hindi', if the phrase lists, dialogues, exercises, and sentences quoted in the documents the British have left behind are any indicator.

However, some people did know the other varieties and styles. Michael Bruce (b. 1927) in North Bihar, says his father, a police officer, knew Hindi and Urdu at three levels: the cultured, the everyday and the bazaar. He could use facetious stories in the bazaar style to dispense a potentially violent crowd (Fleming Vol. l, 2004: 240).

Out of all the accounts of the British children, there is only one in which the child did not learn Hindustani very well. Ann Marindin, reports:

> Our servants (Ayah-Emmy and Latif, bearer) wrote and spoke English, as well as many other Indian languages, so unlike many of my contemporaries I failed to speak Hindi fluently (Fleming Vol. 2: 178).

Some of these children are alive today and the nostalgia of the *raj*, expressed through words of Hindustani to those who understand the language, is very much part of their being as it was of their ancestors, the Anglo-Indians who remembered India,

and their own youth and importance, with the Hindustani words of their time in India.

HINDUSTANI IN THE ROMAN SCRIPT

Hindustani in the Roman script was primarily for the use of the Christian missionaries and the army. As the use of this script has been mentioned in relation to the army in Chapter 10, the other uses will be dealt with here. Among the various reasons given for preferring this script to the others, some given in a transliterated edition of the *Alf Laila* in Urdu, one is that the cost of printing is less, as the 'Arabic script of Urdu takes more space' (Pincott 1882: iv), and the other one is that it helps 'to acquire an accurate knowledge of the vocalization of the Urdu' language (Ibid., iii). But, of course, the main reason was that it was a script known to the British and saved them the effort of learning and writing in another one. There are several versions of the Bible in this script. The language is easy but is closer to Urdu than Modern Hindi (Bible 1860). In addition to the scriptures, there were religious hymns to be accompanied with music in the Roman script. The following is an example of such a tune set to the piano. The words are:

> *Yá Rabb terí janabmen hargiz kamí na-hín*
> *Tu-jha- sá jahán ke*
> *bích to ko-í ga-ní nahin.*
> (O Lord! In thy Kingdom there is no dearth
> There is none in the world
> As generous as Thou art!)
> (Parsons 1875)

Although British officers were divided over patronizing missionaries, some being of the view that the state must not appear to interfere with the natives' religions, some Evangelical Christians did entertain the hope that the dissemination of the

Bible in Hindustani would spread Christianity in the Orient. The Reverend Claudius, writing in 1805, expresses happiness that Fort William College would help in the translation of the Bible (Pearce Vol. 2, 1846: 294). A certain Mr Bachanan, writing to the Archbishop of Canterbury in the same year, exults that in 'the centre of the Pagan world, and at the chief seat of superstition and idolatory' this work of translation is going on and 'the unconverted natives assist in the translations' (Ibid., 296). And Wilberforce, writing in 1813, considered 'the translation and diffusion of the scriptures' the 'most powerful agents in the great work of Christianizing the natives of India' (Ibid., 299). During the 1840s–1850s, a number of Evangelicals had come to India and used the Indian languages, above all Hindustani, to convert the natives. Robert Tucker, the district judge of Fatehpur, had set up large stone columns with the Ten Commandments inscribed in Persian, Urdu, Hindi, and English, and used to read 'the Bible in Hindoostanee to large numbers of natives who were assembled in the compound to hear him' (Hibbert 1978: 52. Quoted from Dalrymple 2006: 61–62).

However, administrators often prevented the more zealous proselytizers from teaching the scriptures in schools. A certain Reverend Jabez Carey, for instance, had introduced them as school books in Rajputana. However, a letter from Fort William to the Resident, Major General Sir David Ochterlony, stopped the experiment and suggested Carey should be given 'suitable Books in Persian and Hindoostany languages from Serampore and from the Calcutta Book Society' instead (Fort William 1822 in Sinha and Dasgupta 1964: 257).

In any case, because the scriptures were available in the Roman script, they were read by many Christians—especially in Kashmir, Punjab and the Hindi belt—whose mother-tongue was not Urdu and who could not even read its script. But, of course, stories such as the *Alf Laila* in Urdu, were also available in this script, which means it was also available for pleasure reading

(Pincott [1882]). It was one of the factors which helped spread the kind of Hindustani which is close to Urdu and Hindi as used on the streets of Pakistani and North Indian cities.

Urdu in the Roman script must have been useful in disseminating the knowledge of the language, or at least the easy version of it to people who could not read the Urdu or the Devanagari scripts. It is now used on the internet to write e-mail messages and chatting on Facebook or other chatrooms among both Indians and Pakistanis. Moreover, a number of personal writings on the internet (blogs) are in this script. A number of erotic, and frankly pornographic, stories purporting to be real-life events are also available on the internet. They are classified as Hindi or Urdu, more on the basis of the setting, names of characters and point of origin rather than any significant lexical difference. Recently, Gallup Pakistan published a report on 7 December 2009, which gave the following information about the use of Urdu on mobile telephones:

> A nationally representative sample of men and women from across the country were asked '*Usually which language do you use for sending SMS from your mobile phone*?' thirty seven per cent (37%) said they send SMS in Urdu typed in English alphabet, 15% use Urdu typed in Urdu alphabet to send text messages whereas 17% said they type SMS in English. Twenty nine per cent (29%) do not send any SMS whereas 2% gave no response (Gallup 2009).

To conclude, the British imagined Hindustani as an India-wide language; a lingua franca, which it probably was not, before their arrival. They spread it all over the country by using it in the army, to talk to servants and subordinates. They also spread it far and wide by using it in the courts of law, the lower levels of administration and teaching it formally in schools all over North India. Moreover, they wrote primers, phrase books, dictionaries, and grammar books in it, thus making it the most commonly known Indian language in their Indian empire. In short, the

imagination, or perception, that it was the language of their Indian empire came first and the reality followed because of the fact that the language was used as if it already was the language of the widest possible communication in the country. The fact that it was the language of wider communication in North India during the eighteenth century is probably correct but it did not have as much spread nor was it used in so many formal and informal domains all over India as it was because of the British understanding of it as the lingua franca of India.

The second aspect of the British understanding of Hindustani is that they equated it with Urdu and favoured the Perso-Arabic script for writing it. They did not favour the highly Persianized variety of it but, on the whole, their Hindustani was closer to easy, or commonly spoken Urdu than it was to either the vernaculars of the Hindi belt or Sanskritized Hindi. This particular understanding was felt to favour Muslims, as Urdu was associated with Muslims, by Hindu nationalists.

Though the British were the first rulers who made such efforts to learn Hindustani and produced so much instructional material in it, they used it from a position of power and, hence, neglected its polite usages and also did not master its grammar fully. This creative an imperative style of Hindustani which goes with the tone of command the British employed in most of their dealings with ordinary Indians. Hindustani influenced English and its words have entered the lexicon of English. This is the enduring fruit of the two-century long contact of the British with India. But another fruit—though less enduring in some cases—is the effect of British use of Hindustani on the princely states of India. To this we turn in the next chapter.

NOTES

1. Hindustan was identified, as William Dalrymple has written, with the Indian States of Haryana, Delhi, UP, and some parts of Madhya Pradesh and Bihar 'where Hindustani is spoken, and the area often referred to in

modern Indian papers as the "Cow Belt".' There was a strong consciousness of this as a unit with Delhi as its centre (Dalrymple 2006: 21 and 489).

2. Queen Victoria's diaries are preserved in the Royal Archives of Windsor. I am indebted to Professor Naeem Qureshi, former professor of History at the Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, for showing me a photograph of a page of the Queen's writing. Sushila Anand also has the facsimile of one page of the diary in her book (Anand 1996).

9

Urdu in the Princely States

The native states of India were fairly autonomous in their internal affairs. Thus the choice of the official language was up to the ruler. In reality, this choice was constrained both by the internal and the external language policy and practices of the states, their neighbouring areas and the inclinations of the ruling elite.

In this chapter we will take two case studies of India's largest and most powerful native states: Hyderabad, ruled by a Muslim; and Kashmir, ruled by a Hindu ruler. Both shifted from Persian to Urdu as official languages and this chapter looks at the history of this change and relates it to the politics of the states and the overall political situation of India. In addition, a synoptic view of the language policies and practices of certain Hindu and Muslim princely states will be touched upon in passing in order to relate these variables to identity politics in India. First, then, let us take the case of Hyderabad.

HYDERABAD

While it is not clear how much Urdu in any of its forms was used in independent kingdoms during the Mughal period, there is evidence to suggest that in the Deccan rulers patronized the language much before North India. For instance, the author of *Basātīn ul salātīn* says concerning the Adil Shahi rulers of Bijapur—Mohammad Adil Shah, Ali Adil Shah Sani and Sikandar Adil Shah who ruled in the seventeenth century—that 'since the

inclination of the king was towards his own idiom which was the
language of the Deccan...so many Hindi poets came to Bijapur'
(*ammā chũ tabaʿā Humāyũ Pādshāh aksar mēl bajānib lughāt-ē-khās
khavēsh yaʾnī zubān-ē-Dakan ast...shuʿara-ē- Hindī gō basiār az khāk-
ē-Bējāpur barkhwāstā and*' (Quoted from Syeda Jafer in Jafer and
Jain Vol. 2, 1998: 377). But this did not mean that Dakhni was
used as an official language.

The state of Hyderabad was carved out in 1724 by the Asif
Jahis, the governors of the Mughal emperors in the Deccan, when
they became powerful enough to set themselves up as rulers in
their own right. The Nizams[1]—from Mir Qamruddin Khan (1724–
48) to the sixth ruler of the house, Mir Mahboob Ali Khan
(1869–1911)—used Persian as their court language, in common
with the prevailing fashion of their times, though they spoke
Urdu at home. Persian was, however, replaced by Urdu in some
domains of power, such as law courts, administration and
education, toward the end of the nineteenth century. This
phenomenon, which may be called the 'Urduization' of the state,
had important consequences. Besides the historical construction
of events, an attempt will be made to understand these
consequences: the link of 'Urduization' with power, the
construction of Muslim identity, and the socio-economic class.
Moreover, the effect of 'Urduization' on the local languages of
Hyderabad will also be touched upon.

LINGUISTIC POLICY OF THE NIZAMS

The question of the language policy of the Muslim rulers of the
Deccan is discussed by Mustafa Kamal in his book on the
development of Urdu in Hyderabad (1990: 17–45). Kamal refers
to the claims of Jamil Jalibi (1987: 185), Naseer Uddin Hashmi
(1923 and 1963), Abdul Qadir Sarwari (1934), Mohiuddin Qadri
Zor (1969), and others, that Urdu—though called Hindi or
Hindvi—was used in some offices of the state in the south.
However, as Kamal points out, these authors refer to the

historian Farishta. But Farishta never claims that Hindi was used in the offices of the state. He narrates the tale of a certain Hasan, the servant of a certain Bahman Kangoo who enjoyed the favour of Muhammad Tughlaq. Kangoo foretold his rise to kingship and made him promise to make him his minister of finance (Farishta Vo. 1: 273–300). He fulfilled this promise when he became the ruler of a part of the Deccan. It was from this time onwards, according to the story, that Hindus started serving Muslim rulers in the revenue department. This story, if true, merely claims that Hindus started serving in the revenue department of the state, but it makes no claim regarding the language they used in their work. To assume that this was some form of Hindi, or the ancestor of Urdu, is not warranted by the evidence at hand.

As for the later rulers of the Deccan, once again Farishta's words are instructive. He writes that during the reign of Ibrahim Adil Shah I (1538–57):

> *va daftar-ē-farsi bārtaraf sā<u>kh</u>tā Hindvi Kard* (Farishta Vol. 2: 27).
> (He dismissed the Persian office and made it Hindvi).

While it is clear that an Indian language was preferred over Persian, it is still not known exactly which language the generic term 'Hindvi' refers to. And, of course, if Brahmins used an Indian language at a later date, it does not follow that they did the same earlier. The existing evidence which Kamal (1990) refers to is that there are several documents in the Deccan with Marathi and even Telugu translations from Persian, but none with Hindvi (or old Urdu-Hindi) translations. It stands to reason, then, that the local languages, rather than some variety of Urdu-Hindi, were used at the lower levels of the administration. These local languages may have been referred to as 'Hindvi' or 'Hindi', i.e. the language of Hind, but this does not necessarily mean that one of them was the ancestor of Urdu.

The Nizams, then, ruled over a multi-religious, multilingual state where there was a tradition of using languages other than

Persian in some public domains. The rulers themselves were mostly Urdu-speaking Muslims, but the majority of the common people were Hindus who spoke Marathi, Telugu, Canarese, and other languages. The information pertaining to this diversity is summarized below:

Table 1		
Religious Composition of Hyderabad State		
	Number	Educated People (%)
Hindus	8,893,181	2.9
Muslims	925,929	4.9
Christians	13,614	51.8
Jains	8,521	8.9
Parsis	638	56.1
Sikhs	3,664	12.9
Jews	47	19.1
Total	9,945,594	
Source: Census of 1871 (in Ali, C. 1880–86, Vol. 4, p. 391 and p. 434).		

The linguistic composition was even more pluralistic.

Table 2	
Language/Speakers in Hyderabad State	
Telugu	4,266,469
Marathi	3,147,745
Kanarese	1,238,519
Urdu	928,241
Source: Census 1871 (in Ibid., 432).	

At this time, the census reports, 'Persian is the official language of the Government, but it differs slightly from that now spoken in Persia' (Ibid., 455). The Andhra Archives contain letters,

treaties and other documents in Persian up to the time of
Mahbub Ali Khan, when Urdu documents start taking their place.
Among these are letters of five governors-general: Warren
Hastings (10 July 1784), John Macpherson (23 May 1786),
Cornwallis (26 January 1792), John Shore (10 February 1797), and
Lord Dufferin (17 March 1888), all in Persian. Even the letter of
Maharaja Sri Samar Singh Bahadur, ruler of Marwar, though
written long after Persian was the court language of the state
(23 March 1911), is, nevertheless, in Persian. The treaties of 1792
and 1822, between the East India Company and the Nizam were,
of course, in Persian, though a memorandum of 13 August 1872
between the British Government and the state of Hyderabad, is
in English (all reproduced in Pachauri 1993, 2–20). However,
interestingly, Hyderabad city was predominantly Urdu-speaking,
and Canarese is not represented at all, though Arabic is (see
Table 3). There were also 6,643 speakers of English in the city.
The linguistic composition is as follows:

Table 3	
Languages Spoken in Hyderabad City (%)	
Telugu	22.29%
Marathi	4.25%
Canarese	Not given
Urdu	67.25%
Arabic	3.07%
Source: (Ibid., 456).	

The Nizams had, of course, imposed Persian on the natives, who
differed from them both in religion and language. This, however,
was the common practice of that period for which the Mughals
provided a model. What the Nizams did, however, was to use the
indigenous languages of the people at certain levels of the

administration, which the Mughals had done earlier, but had stopped after Akbar (r. 1556–1605).

In Hyderabad state, however, the local languages were used as media of instruction in schools. There were, for instance, 162 educational institutions in 1880–81, out of which 105 were Persian, 35 Marathi, 19 Telugu, and 3 English-medium schools (Ali, C. Vol. 1: 128). Also, there were both Persian and Marathi clerks in the districts of the state (Ibid., Vol. 2: 197).

Moreover, different departments gave orders in Persian as well as a local language. In order to write them so that they could be read by the public, writers (*muharrir*) of the two languages were hired at a salary of twenty-five rupees per month (*Jarīdā* 1885, Vol. 3: 304). One such order states:

> Shahpur Ji raised the point that the rules for the toll taxes on the road, which are a copy of those already used for the road to Gulbarga, should, in addition to being added to the gazette, also be written in Persian and Marathi and be pasted on every check post and every place for the information of everybody (*Jarida* Vol. 3: 304).

At another place, an order by Prime Minister (*Madār ul Mahām*) Mir Turab Ali Khan Salar Jang I, who held office between 1853 and 1883, states:

> The questions will be in the Urdu language but those who answer them can translate them and write their answers in Talangi or Marathi or English. However, anyone who answers them in any language except Urdu will have to appear for an examination in the Urdu language on the fifth day (Ibid., Vol. 4: 308).

When district land surveys began in 1886, a school was established in order to teach the principles of surveying in Marathi in addition to others languages (Ali, C. 1885–86, Vol. 2: 197). Indeed, the diary of Salar Jang I of 8 January 1880, records

that he told the students during his tour of the Aurangabad Districts:

> From the Putwari's office to that of the Talookdar and all official communications are made in that language. Not to learn Maratti [sic] therefore is to place yourselves outside the pale of official employment (Quoted in Ali, S. M. 1883–86, Vol. 3: 195).

The Prime Minister talked to the assistant settlement officers, both Muslims and Hindus, and recorded in his diary:

> I desired them to hold a conversation in Maratti [sic], in order that I might judge of their attainments in that language. I found that they spoke it fluently. I was astonished to find them so proficient both as regards speaking and writing (Ibid., 200).

Schools were not only in Marathi or Telugu. There were, for instance, nine Canarese schools in 1884–85 (Adm Hyd 1886: 176). The 'Inspectors of schools were ordered to pass in the vernaculars of their district' (Ibid., 179).

In short, the linguistic policy of the Hyderabad state was to use the indigenous languages—Marathi, Telugu and Canarese—in some public domains. In time, however, Urdu replaced not only Persian in the domains of power, but also these indigenous languages in certain other domains (mainly education). Thus, the transition from Persian to Urdu represents not just a simple substitution of one language for another, but also a change in the self-representation of the Urdu-speaking ruling elite; a corresponding change in the mobilization of religious-cum-linguistic identities: Hindus being defined by the indigenous languages and the Muslims by Urdu. In short, the change led to the politicization of language in the Hyderabad state in a way that reflects the overall mobilization of Hindu and Muslim identities in India.

SYMBOLIC SIGNIFICANCE OF PERSIAN
FOR THE OLD GUARD

In common with the rest of Muslim India, the elite of Hyderabad considered Persian an essential part of their cultural heritage and a marker of their elitist identity and political domination. The Paigah nobility of Hyderabad state, which held vast landed estates and political power, studied Persian as part of their socialization.

The children of the elite were taught Persian at home but schools were also opened for them by the late nineteenth century. For instance, the first Salar Jang's sons were initially taught in the palace. In 1877, the class was removed to Rumbolt's Kothi where it came to be known as the Madrassa-i-Aliya. In this institution, Englishmen were appointed headmasters. The school had an English and an oriental side, and Persian, along with 'Arabic, Hindustani and vernacular languages' were taught there (Adm Hyd 1886: 192). The Madrassa-i-Aizza was another elitist institution where boys were taught Persian along with other subjects (Ibid., 194). Hyderabad College was also an offshoot of the Dar-ul-Umar Oriental College, 'which was founded by the late Minister in 1855 for the teaching of English, Arabic, Persian, Telugu, and Marathi' (Ali, S.M. 1883–86, Vol. 8, Part 2: 435). However, the upper classes of the urban areas, especially Hyderabad city, paid more attention to Persian in the beginning and then moved to English and Urdu, as those languages gained currency in the domains of power. Even the ladies of the upper classes were so conversant in Persian that local gossip in the English press was translated 'in Persian having, it is whispered, found their way into the innermost recesses of the zananas' (Ibid., Vol. 8, Part 2: 663). At the uppermost level, as in the durbar, the Viceroy's speech was translated into Persian and read out to the Nizam on 22 February 1884 (in Ibid., Vol. 8, Part 2: 798).

Even up to 1885, when Urdu was gaining strength, the upper-class boys of Madrassa-i-Aliya were praised for having improved in Persian. It was further emphasized that 'Hyderabad youths cannot dispense with their own classics, if they wish to make themselves useful in after-life' (Ali, S.M. 1886: 372). Persian was a symbol of Muslim cultural and political domination until it was replaced by Urdu. The replacement itself was not without opposition. According to Sarwar Jang, tutor of Mir Mahbub Ali Khan, the sixth Nizam (1866–1911), when he expressed (in the presence of Salar Jang I) his agreement with Maulvi Mushtaq Hussain's proposal that Urdu should replace Persian in all offices of the state, the Minister's reaction was as follows:

> As soon as he heard this he sat up straight. Earlier he had been reclining on a bolster but now he sat bolt upright and said: 'God forbid!' He prolonged the 'a' of *Khudā* so much that I was very disturbed and understood that I had made a mistake. Later he said that you Hindustanis are not competent in Persian writing and speech. Persian is the symbol of Muslim victories and we are from the victorious nation and have conquered this country by force of arms. In your own country [North India] you have done away with this symbol and now you want to do the same here also. As long as I am alive, Persian too will remain alive (Jang 1933: 244).

However, in practice the Minister used Urdu wherever it suited him—such as in meetings with the Resident, so as to prevent him from dominating the conversation if it was held in English. But at this time, while Salar Jang I's own orders were in Persian, other departments had started issuing orders in Urdu (*Jarida* 1885). However, so much was the fashion of using Persian on formal occasions that the *marsiyā*, on the death of Salar Jang in 1883, was written, among others, by Hali also in Persian (Hali 1879: 395–97). The actual teaching of Persian was also declining by the time Mahbub Ali Khan was studying. His tutor, Sarwar Jang, reports that the young Nizam's time was being wasted in

the learning of Persian because his teachers were unsuitable for this purpose. Moreover, the time for Persian was also reduced (Jang 1933: 211). The Nizam's learning of Urdu will be touched upon later. What is notable is that, according to his tutor, the Nizam was not competent in Persian. Thus, when the Viceroy, Lord Dufferin, who was learning Persian, paid a visit to the state, he began to converse in that language with the Nizam. Knowing that his pupil was not competent in Persian, Sarwar Jang suggested that, because Persian was understood by many who should not be privy to the conversation, it was more expedient that the conversation should be in English (Ibid., 272).

Thus, before the actual change of the official language, it had started losing out to both Urdu and English in importance. The change, however, involved bureaucratic procedures and orders which are described below.

TRANSITION FROM PERSIAN TO URDU

To understand this transition it must be placed in the context of state politics: specifically the tension between the locals of Hyderabad (*Mulkīs*) and the outsiders, mostly the Urdu-speaking Muslims of North India (*Ghaēr Mulkīs*). The tension increased so much that Mahbub Ali Khan asked for a report on employment and his prime minister submitted a report which has been summarized as follows:

	Total Number of Civil Officers	Total Number (%)	Aggregate Salary (%)
Natives	246	51.7	42.00
The rest:	230	48.3	58.00
Hindustanis	97	20.38	24.44
Madrasis	66	13.87	11.40
Bombayites	36	7.56	8.06
Europeans	24	5.04	13.38
Others	7	1.47	0.72
Source: Sajanlal 1974: 130 column 1.			

The Nizam pointed out that the outsiders drew a higher aggregate salary. The Prime Minister explained that the outsiders (non-*Mulkīs*) were more qualified and had, therefore, been appointed to more lucrative and powerful positions (Ibid., 132). They were so powerful that the Executive Council, carrying out the administration, had twelve members at one time, 'all Hindustanees or foreigners' (Ali, S.M. 1886: 68).

Newspapers were full of complaints against Salar Jang I. The *Deccan Times* (18 February 1880) reported:

> It is notorious that the employment of 'Hindustanees' in places of position and trust has engendered a bitter feeling against the Minister, who is not unnaturally accused of taking the bread out of the children's mouths and giving it to strangers (In Ali, S. M. Vol. 3: 441).

The Hindustanis had come from British India where they had been using Urdu rather than Persian in their youth—the language of schooling and the courts being Urdu since the 1840s—they were in favour of using Urdu in the affairs of the state. Among the most prominent of them were: Imad ul Mulk, who came to Hyderabad in 1773; Mahdi Ali Khan (1874); Waqar ul Mulk (1875); Chiragh Ali Yar Jang (1877); and Deputy Nazir Ahmed (1877). V.K. Bawa, a biographer of Osman Ali Khan, mentions other important literary figures of Urdu who came from North India and whose stay in Hyderabad, whether brief or lengthy, must have increased the salience of Urdu in the state (Bawa 1992: 56–58). It is credible, then, that these powerful Hindustani officials created a lobby which promoted Urdu in the state.

Syed Husain Bilgrami (Nawab Imad ul Mulk) was the Indian tutor of Osman Ali Khan and the chief executive of education for thirty-two years (Haq 1959: 391). He was a great supporter of Urdu as a medium of instruction (Ibid., 409). As adviser to the Prime Minister, Nawab Mir Yusuf Ali Khan Salar Jang III (1888–1949), he issued a notice that English words should not be used

in Urdu documents (Ibid., 415). In short, the pro-Urdu lobby remained active even after the replacement of Persian by Urdu— now to counter the influx of English.

The pro-Urdu campaign was primarily against Persian, but it also sought to remove, or at least restrict, the usage of local languages in the affairs of the state. Mushtaq Hussain, better known as Waqar ul Mulk, held a judicial position (*Mō'tamid-ē-Adālat*) from 1878 onwards. He was also a Member of Revenue. He opposed the use of the local languages on the grounds that higher officials did not understand them, and signed orders on the behest of their subordinates without understanding their implications (Kamal 1990: 141).

PERSIAN GIVES PLACE TO URDU

The sequence of events relating to the transition from Persian to Urdu in Hyderabad state has been described admirably by Syed Mustafa Kamal (Ibid., 96–133). I follow his narration of events but have checked and consulted the Persian sources in the Andhra State Archives in Hyderabad which were used by Kamal. In the few cases where they were missed for lack of time, the reference is to the original source as quoted by Kamal. Previous and subsequent sections use sources not used by Kamal and, of course, the analysis and conclusions are my own and are different from existing works in this area.

Kamal points out that, notwithstanding the influence of the Hindustanis in favour of Urdu, the transition to the language was pioneered by a blue-blooded Hyderabad aristocrat, Bashir ud Daulah Sir Asman Jah (b. 1839). He was appointed the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court (*Sadr-ul-Mahām Adālat*) in 1869. In 1871 he proposed that Urdu be used in place of Persian in the courts of law. Prime Minister Sir Salar Jang I conceded only that 'the recording of statements in Urdu, that is, the language in common use, is enough (*sirf qalam bandī izhārāt bazubān-ē-Urdū yenī zubān-ē-murawwajā ĩ jā kāfī ast*)'. However, 'all other writing

would have to be in Persian (*dīgar hamā tā taehrīrāt ba Fārsi zurūr ast*)' (*Jarida* 1885: 4:217). Bashir ud Daulah tried to obtain more concessions for Urdu, but this time the prime minister rebuffed him in the following words:

> But this revival [of the pro-Urdu movement] is not acceptable to His Exalted Highness [...] because many people do not know the skills for writing (standard) Urdu. [*Magar ĩ taehrīk-e-sānī az Sarkār-e-'Ālī manzūr nashud* [...] *ba ĩ lehāz ke bāz ashkhāsrā salīqā taehrīr dar zubān-e-Urdū namī bāshad.*] (Ibid., 47, quoted in Kamal 1990: 101).

Moreover, the prime minister clarified that Urdu was merely permitted, it was not necessary (*mumāni'yat nīst va ilā az tarf-ē-madār-ul-mahām isrār nīst*) (in Kamal 1990: 101).

In 1876 the prime minister agreed that the administrators (*nazamā*) and the clerks (munshis) had gained competence in Urdu. It was, however, clarified that their Urdu writing was not meant to exhibit their mastery of difficult Persian words. By 'Urdu,' said the order, a high, literary style was not meant (*Urdū-ē-mu'allā murād nīst*) (quoted from Ibid., 106).

By 1883, it appears that the conservative Salar Jang I was no longer as adamant about retaining Persian as he had been earlier because he gave more concessions to Urdu two days before his death (Ibid., 114), though his orders for the courts were published after his death on 8 February 1883. It appears that he reasoned that if Marathi and Telugu were allowed for officials to record their decisions, then those whose mother-tongue was Urdu should be similarly facilitated (*Jarīdā* 1885: 1:413). The formal shift in the language of the state took place in the time of Mir Laiq Ali Khan Salar Jang II, who was appointed to the prime-ministership on 5 February 1884 and resigned from the post in 1887.

The first order, dated 21 February 1884, is about the use of Urdu for all types of work in the courts. First, the prime minister complains about the linguistic confusion prevalent in the courts.

Officials use both Urdu and Persian as they please. Then, he advances the argument that this state of affairs must be ended by using the most easily understood language, namely Urdu. In conclusion, the Urdu order says clearly:

> Thus *Madārul Mahām* is pleased to order that as soon as this order reaches the offices of the court, from that time all the work in those offices will be in Urdu (Ibid., Vol. 5: 3 Quoted from Kamal 1990: 117).

Moreover, the officials were asked to write simple rather than ornate and Persianized Urdu (Ibid., 118). However, rural offices would continue to function in the local languages (Kamal 1990: 129–30). The *talukdārs* (landed gentlemen) were ordered to address higher authorities in Urdu. Local languages were to be tolerated, but not in urban areas such as Hyderabad, where only Urdu was to be used (Ibid., 131–32). Another symbolic event was a speech delivered by Mahbub Ali Khan to the first meeting of the Council of State held on 28 February 1884. This is in Urdu and the language is simple and understandable (Pachauri 1993: 71). In 1886 all offices were ordered to work in Urdu (*Jarīdā* Vol. 5: 4. Quoted from Kamal 1990: 132–133).

The summary of the memorandum on this subject (Item No. 176, June 1886) as presented by the prime minister to the nizam is as follows:

> Solicits sanction for the use of Urdu instead of Persian in all official correspondence, and adds that it is the Secretaries to Government who use Persian in official correspondence, whereas Urdu was adopted in all the offices. Also speaks of the advantages and facilities afforded by the use of Urdu language. The Nizam sanctions the introduction of Urdu in all correspondence carried out by the Secretaries to Government (quoted in Sajanlal 1974: 142).

After this, the Urduization of the state took place very quickly. First, let us look at the expansion of Urdu in the domain of

education—a domain as important as the administrative and judicial domains and which, indeed, feeds both.

URDU AND THE ROYALTY

As mentioned earlier, Urdu was taught even when Persian was the official language of the state. The Census of 1871 recorded that 'Arabic, Persian, and Hindustani' as well as English are taught (Ali, C. 1885–86, Vol. 4: 471). Royalty were also taught Urdu in addition to Persian and English. The Resident, Mr Saunders, addressed Salar Jang I on 12 January 1871 in 'Hindoostanee,' hoping that it was a language that would 'bear good fruit at Hyderabad... (Ali, S.M. 1883, Vol. 1: 54).

The young Nizam, Mahbub Ali Khan, was educated under the supervision of an English tutor, but he was taught Urdu and Persian as well as English. The overall in-charge of the young Nizam's education was Captain John Clerk, son of G.R. Clerk, Governor of Bombay. He arrived in Hyderabad in January 1875. Sarwar Jang, the young Nizam's Indian tutor, mentions how the Prince was taught by elderly, sycophantic courtiers—certainly not the best way to teach a child. However, at the end of 1879, the Prince's 'report card showed he was doing well in Geography, Arithmetic and Urdu' (Zubrzycki 2006: 92). Sarwar Jang also describes how the teaching of Persian was replaced with that of Urdu, which was taught until four o'clock in the afternoon, and calligraphy in its script was taught for half an hour (Jang 1933: 211).

Later, when the question of the education of Mir Osman Ali Khan came up, by this date, at least in British minds, Urdu was important enough to be taught to a major princely ally of the empire. The Resident wrote, '[He should] begin with his own vernacular—Urdu'—but also, 'parri passu, learn English' (Durant 1892). Accordingly, both English and Urdu were taught to the future ruler. For Urdu, Syed Hussain Bilgrami was appointed tutor to the young prince in 1895. And for English, he had an

English tutor—Bryan (later Sir) Egerton. In addition there were Indian tutors (*atalīqs*) who taught Arabic, Persian, Urdu and English (Bawa 1992: 40–41).

Others in the royal family, such as Osman Ali Khan's daughter-in-law, Durreshehwar (d. 2006)—mother of Mir Barkat Ali Khan Mukarram Jah (b. 1938), the eighth Nizam, who held the title from 1967 until 1971, and daughter of Sultan Abdul Majeed of Turkey—learned it from Aga Haider Hasan Mirza (Zubrzycki 2006: 155). She became fluent in Urdu in less than a year. Mukarram's education was in Madrassa-i-Aliya to begin with, but then he went to Doon School and Harrow (Ibid., 167). Even Mukarram Jah's Turkish wife, Esra Birgin, learned to speak Urdu (Ibid., 224). However, in keeping with the increasing modernization and Anglicization of the Indian elite, the young princes were learning more English than any other language through their schooling.

The royalty were not the only ones to learn Urdu, of course. The common people, and especially the middle classes, learned it in order to find employment. There were many institutions and people to promote the learning of Urdu. One of the personalities associated with Urdu, Maulvi Abdul Haq, has been dealt with earlier. Among other things, he wrote two pamphlets on letter-writing in Urdu in 1901. In the second, there is a letter from a father to a son exhorting him to take an interest in the mother-tongue (Urdu). The son agrees and sets out on this path. These pamphlets were written at the request of Syed Husain Bilgrami, probably in his capacity as the Nizam's tutor. Thus Abdul Haq thus tried to sow the seed of love for Urdu in the future ruler's breast (Chand 1930: 34).

Maulvi Abdul Haq was also one of the pioneers of Osmania University. He presided over the Dar-ul-Tarjuma and invited eminent people from North India: Zafar Ali Khan, Abdul Majid Daryabadi, Abdul Haleem Sharar, Waheed ud Din Saleem, Syed Sulaiman Nadvi, Maulana Mirza Mehdi Khan, Ross Masood, and

others (Imami 1930: 133). Abdul Haq considered Urdu, as he told one of his friends, also called Abdul Haq, that he considered him a 'true Muslim' because one characteristic of a Muslim was 'the love of Urdu' (*Urdū kī muhabbat*) (Sarwari 1930: 158). Thus, while the upper classes were switching to English in response to increasing Anglicization, the middle classes were fully given to education in Urdu.

URDU IN THE DOMAIN OF EDUCATION

There are several accounts of the spread of Urdu in the domain of education in Hyderabad. A detailed account, by Syed Mohiuddin Qadri Zor (1934), informs the reader about Osman Ali Khan's role in the propagation of Urdu. Another book, by Abdul Qadir Sarwari (1934), gives even more facts and figures about the gradual progress of Osmania University. Both end on a triumphant note because the year 1934, when they were first published, was a high point in the life of Urdu in Hyderabad. It was left to later historians, such as Kamal (1990) and Arshad (1988), to lament the downfall of Urdu after India took over, creating the state of Andhra Pradesh. The ascendant language now was English, though Telugu and other languages were used at the lower level in ordinary schools and in the lower domains of power. The Bureau of Translation (*Dār-ul Tarjumā*) produced 382 books and provided employment for 129 translators. It burned down in 1955, though some of the books, which had been translated earlier, are to be found in the Nizam Trust Library in Hyderabad (Bedar 1979: 228). Osmania's Department of Urdu is still proud of its history as the present author found during his visit to it in January 2008.

In 1997, in response to the growing demand for raising the status of Urdu in India, the authorities agreed to the establishment of an Urdu-medium university in Hyderabad. Accordingly, the 'Maulana Azad National Urdu University [MANUU] Act 1996, No. 2 of 1997' was passed. On 9 January 1998, the MANUU was

established in order to 'promote and develop the Urdu language, provide higher, technical and vocational education in the Urdu medium…' (MANUU, n.d.). At the moment, the university has twelve departments and twenty-eight programmes of study functioning in Urdu. It has a Department of Translation and an Urdu Cultural Centre which preserves archival material including works of art related to the Urdu-using Indian culture.

However, it is obvious from the tone of protest and lamentation coming from the Muslims of Hyderabad, which the present author witnessed during a function for the promotion of Urdu on 9 January 2008, that Urdu is a political grievance for the Muslim community. It also suggests that, for all the rhetoric about Urdu being a heritage of both Muslims and Hindus, the Muslims of Hyderabad (in common with other Indian Muslims) think of it as part of their Muslim identity and part of their specifically Muslim heritage.

POLITICAL ASPECTS OF
THE URDUIZATION OF HYDERABAD

While the Hindi-Urdu controversy weakened the hold of Urdu on the cultural life of North India during the first half of the twentieth century, it became stronger and dominated the local languages in the Hyderabad state.

The domination of Urdu is described, unfortunately, in a triumphant rather than a detached style, by some Muslim writers (Sarwari 1934; Zor 1934). Mustafa Kamal (1990), whose work is otherwise distinguished by the number and authority of the sources he refers to, also does not refer to the political dimension of the Urdu policy of the state. (For a detailed discussion of the policy of the Urduization of education in Hyderabad see Rahman 2002: 231–36). Suffice it to say here that Urdu was promoted in the state at two levels. At the upper level, it was used for higher education, which was in English in British India; at the lower level, it was promoted at the expense of the local languages,

which, as we have seen, had a strong presence in the administration. The creation of Osmania University in 1917, and its emergence as a symbol of the possibility of replacing English at the university level, was a triumph which still inspires people in South Asia.

The scheme for a university in Hyderabad has been traced back to the time of Salar Jang I. In 1875, Sheikh Ahmad Hussain Rifat Yar Jang proposed the establishment of such an institution without making English the medium of instruction. He wrote in Persian that it was 'difficult for Indians to study all subjects in English and the attempt would be a waste of time (*taehsīl ē jumlā 'ulūm ō funūn bāmardam-ē-Hind dar zubān-ē-angrēzī bavujūh kasīr qatan dushvār ō mōjib tazīh auqāt ast...*)'. To this the prime minister replied in the same language: 'I have seen each word and am pleased and felicitate the author and consider this idea very useful (*hamā harfan harfan dīdam ō masrūr shudam ō taehsīn kardam ō ī tadbīr rā mufīd mī pindāram*)' (Ahmad 1979: 103). However, the idea was not implemented until much later, although the medium of instruction at the university is not clearly indicated. The proposal which succeeded was put forward by Wilfrid Scawen Blunt (1840–1922), a British writer and a sympathizer of the Muslims, (Ali, S.M. 1886: 314–17). Jamaluddin Afghani (1838–1897), an important Muslim political figure and visionary of the period, was also a supporter of such a university as a symbol of Muslim civilization. Nevertheless, the university was not immediately established, though the movement in support of it gathered momentum. Eventually, the Nizam's order establishing this university, now called Osmania University, was issued in Urdu on 26 April 1917. It states clearly that the medium of instruction will be 'our language Urdu (*hamārī zubān Urdū*)', but English will retain its educational importance (Pachauri 1993: 45). Another order (14 August 1917) establishes the Translation Bureau of the University (*Shō'bā-ē-Tarjumā*) charged with

translating important works from other languages into Urdu (Ibid., 47).

The University was immediately welcomed by eminent individuals. Rabrindranath Tagore, himself the pioneer of a university (Shantiniketan), wrote on 9 January 1918, congratulating Sir Akbar Hydari, the then prime minister of the state. Among other things he said, 'I have long been waiting for the day when, freed from the shackle of a foreign language, our education becomes naturally accessible to all our people' (quoted in Ibid., 48). The note of triumph struck in this letter was the norm rather than the exception. Indeed, the triumph is all that gets noticed in most writings. The curtailment of space for the local languages is not mentioned at all.

In fact, both are different aspects of the same policy. This policy was defended before the Blatter Commission on 4 October 1924 by Sir Ross Masood, Minister of Education of Hyderabad, on the grounds that 'you will find Marathi boys speaking Urdu' even in remote villages' (Masood 1924: 20). Thus, from 1944 onwards, all secondary schools used Urdu as the medium of instruction—until 1941, 363 out of 444 secondary schools used the mother-tongue as the medium of instruction—though primary schools could still operate in the local languages (Jang 1944).

The Hindus protested but to no avail and the local languages were marginalized (Resident 1944 a). The press carried reports about the discriminatory policies of the Nizam towards the Hindus, such as the highest posts being dominated by Muslims, etc:

> Other allegations included making Osmania a 'Sectarian' University and the giving of Prominence to Urdu, neglecting the other local languages. The last allegation, regarding the neglect of the languages of the Hindus, was emphasized by Nihal Singh (*Hindu* 11 October 1923. Quoted in Subramanyam 1991: 90).

The British realized the political and ideological motives of the Nizam's decision-makers as Sir Arthur Lothian, the Resident, suggests:

> [...] that the predominating motive of Sir Akbar Hydari, the original protagonist of the policy, was to enforce a Muslim culture throughout the state and so strengthen the Muslim hold on Hyderabad in the event of Federation or independence for India in any other form (Resident 1944 b).

The British did not, however, interfere because the Nizam was their loyal ally. It was only after Hyderabad was absorbed into the Indian Union that this policy was finally reversed.

THE JAMMU AND KASHMIR STATE

Let us now take the case of the Jammu and Kashmir state, which was the opposite of the Hyderabad state, with large Muslim concentrations ruled by Hindus. This state, the second largest in size in British India after Hyderabad, made Urdu its official language in place of Persian in 1889. But, while Hyderabad was ruled by the Muslim elite, who had shifted to Urdu and actually spoke Urdu at home, the Dogra rulers of Kashmir spoke Dogri, a variety of Punjabi, as a mother-tongue. It is something of an enigma, then, that the Jammu and Kashmir state opted for Urdu as the state language.

There are two books specifically on the rule of Urdu in Kashmir: Kaefvi (1979) and Sarwari (1993). Both are in Urdu and both tend to be chronological narratives with details of events but almost no analysis relating to them. This section fills in this gap relating the change of the official language from Persian to Urdu to the political and social realities of the Kashmir state.

The state of Jammu and Kashmir was more heterogeneous and multilingual than any other princely state in British India. The Dogras from Jammu spoke Dogri; the people of the vale of

Kashmir, both Hindus and Muslims, spoke Kashmiri; while the Ladakhis spoke Ladakhi. Then there were many other languages— Balti, Burushaski, Shina, Khowar, etc.—dotted all over the state. Persian was the language of the government while the British residents and Europeans used English. Urdu too was present as the Punjab, adjacent to the state, used it in all the lower domains of power, and people travelled to and from the state to the Punjab and the rest of British India.

The state came in closer contact with Urdu when Maharajah Ranbir Singh (r. 1856–1885) sent troops to Delhi to aid the British during the uprising of 1857. These troops came in contact with Urdu-speakers and a letter from this period is said to be in Dr Kiran Singh's possession (Sarwari 1993, Vol. 1: 86). Urdu was known at least to some officials of the state as Mehta Sher Singh, a high official of the Kashmir state, wrote a report on adjoining countries in Urdu (Ibid., Vol. 2: 100–102). Maharajah Ranbir Singh seems to have patronized Urdu as he got English books translated into that language (Sarwari 1993, Vol. 2: 83; Din 1985: 34).

Besides the state itself, a number of non-state agents established institutions which strengthened the presence of Urdu in Kashmir. For instance, a vicegerent (*Khalīfā*), of the Ahmedis called Hakim Maulvi Nurud Din, established the office of *Tasnīf-ō-Talīf* (writing and compilation) from 1876 to 1890 (Kaefvi 1979: 15). The Christian missionaries also established their schools which used Urdu for teaching (Kaefvi 1979: 22–23). Moreover, the state constantly imported functionaries from British India who were at home in Urdu, even if it was not their mother-tongue. Besides, bureaucrats of all ranks, even low-ranking *naqībs* and the body guard of the ruler, were Urdu-speaking (Kaefvi 1979: 21–23). The Education Department employed a number of people from North India with the encouragement of Ranbir Singh (Ram 1883: 612).

During Maharajah Ranbir Singh's rule, Urdu was so well established that the Criminal Code of the State was written in Urdu (Ansari 1996: 167). The ruler also set up a printing-press and the state's first Urdu newspaper *Bidyā Bilās* was published in Jammu (Ansari 1996: 167). The printed word in North India was increasingly in Urdu by the end of the nineteenth century and, along with officials, students, teachers, and tourists, it was finding its way into Kashmir (Ahmad, A 1972).

The actual change of the official language from Persian to Urdu took place during the rule of Maharajah Pratap Singh (r. 1885–1925). While the discussions pertaining to this change are not known, there are proposals about it. For instance, the judicial member of the Maharajah's Council proposed that Urdu should be used in the courts of Jammu. After a long preamble stating that some courts in Jammu conduct business in Persian while others do so in Urdu, the proposal says that Urdu is so well-known in Jammu that witnesses will understand it better than Persian. Then he comes to the heart of the matter.

> Keeping in view these facts I recommend that the courts in Jammu Province be allowed to conduct official business in the Urdu language. Regarding Srinagar province the status quo has to be maintained because Urdu is not understood in that valley and the people are quite conversant with the Persian language (photocopy of the Urdu original is in Din 1985: 478).

The government passed orders (Circular No. 3 of 10 *Phagan* 1945 [1888]) (see orders in English saying 'forwarded to Chief Minister' in Din 1985: 479).

A judge of the High Court requested the Maharajah to allow the courts in Srinagar to use Urdu too, but this was turned down (photocopy in Din 1985: 474). The government wanted to move slowly, probably because of opposition from the Persian-educated Kashmiri Pandits, but eventually Persian was phased out and Urdu took its place.

THE SPREAD OF URDU

While the courts and other official institutions gave Urdu its legal position in the Kashmir State, its spread took place through cultural means also. Urdu poetry and drama were much celebrated events in Kashmir. From 1924 there were yearly *mushairās*. In one of them, held in 1927, Hafeez Jalandhri also came to much acclaim (Kaefvi 1979: 52–53). There were a number of bodies—Anjuman (established in 1895); Bazm-e-Urdu Jammu-o-Kashmir (1937) and the Bazm-e-Mushaira (1914)—functioning to promote Urdu poetry. The dramas of Agha Hashar Kashmiri were so popular that a 'Hashar Day' was celebrated (Sarwari 1993, Vol. 2: 139). The drama (*Nātak*) companies also used Urdu as the language of the dialogues (Ibid., 472–473; Ansari 1996: 168). Tourism was another pro-Urdu incentive as the local guides, hoteliers and boatmen learned Urdu to entertain guests from the plains of North India (Kaefvi 1979: 28). The recruiting officers of the army gave speeches in Urdu rather then Kashmiri or Dogri as between 9 and 11 February 1918 (Kaefvi 1979: 31–39). Besides, the constant inflow of Punjabis, whose formal language of work was Urdu, was changing the linguistic environment of the workplace in Kashmir, even if the common people did not speak Urdu well.

The state of Urdu's progress is reflected in reports from the State. The *Census* of 1911 tells us that '...the people (especially in Kashmir) confound Persian and Urdu most inextricably in common parlance' (Census-K 1912 Part 2: 49). Even in 1921, 'Next to Urdu, Persian is cultivated by the largest number of persons both among Hindus and Musalmans' (Census-K 1923: 115). However, by 1911, all state business was conducted in Urdu, except in the secretariat where there was also an English branch in order to communicate with the imperial government (Census-K 1912 Part 1: 14–43).

The fact that Urdu was used in the domains of power did not mean, however, that it was also used informally in private

conversation. Thus, the Census of 1921 reports that 'Urdu, as a spoken language, does not play any important part here' and is 'confined to a very limited number of state officials, traders, etc, from the United Provinces or other Urdu-speaking localities' (Census-K 1923: 127). However, Urdu was gaining ground even in the private domain. For instance, by this time, it was 'gaining in popularity as a medium of private correspondence, though Hindi and Dogri are still used in the Jammu Province by tradesmen and people of the old school. Similarly, Persian is still used in Kashmir and Gilgit Baltistan (Census-K 1923: 130). Written Urdu was gaining ground because young people were not used to writing any other language in their schools. This situation is similar to that of Punjabi and Pashto-speaking people in Pakistan who write letters in Urdu to each other but speak in their mother-tongue when they meet.

URDU AND THE KASHMIRI PANDITS

The Kashmiri Pandits were part of the Maharajah's civil bureaucracy. They cultivated Persian, the official language of the state, till the 1880s, when the shift towards Urdu started manifesting itself. Zutshi argues that the Kashmiri Pandits picked up Urdu primarily because they belonged to an administrative class while the Muslims got left behind (Zutshi 2004: 190). Initially the Pandits seemed to be keen on retaining Persian which they knew better than their competitors, the Punjabis. However, as pressure from the immigrant Punjabis grew and more and more Kashmiris got educated in British India, where they learnt Urdu rather than Persian, the Pandits gave in to Urdu.

According to Miridu Rai, the State turned away from the Pandits in 1889 'when the State Council changed the court language' (Rai 2004: 243). Thus, the Pandits came under pressure in the State when non-state immigrants, who were used to Urdu rather than Persian, increased. However, as Sender Henny, in his

detailed study of the Kashmiri Pandits notes, the Pandits could switch over from Persian to Urdu. In North India, he tells us:

> The shift from Persian to Urdu in 1889 as the official language did not alter the monopoly by Persian literates of the court system; recruitment remained confined to the traditional elite... (Henny 1988: 240).

Thus, it was not for want of skills or adaptability that the Pandits felt concerned about the change of the state language. Their concern was because the number of Punjabis was increasing and, as their power in the court of the Maharaja grew, they invited others to join them. To the Pandits it seemed as if they would be deprived of their rightful share in the state's resources.

URDU AND THE PUNJABIS

In common with other native states the major division among the educated salaried class in Kashmir during the British period was between the locals and the outsiders. The outsiders were generally Punjabis who sought employment, hitherto the monopoly of the Kashmiri Pandits, in the state bureaucracy. According to the British Resident of Kashmir, Sir Francis Younghusband, there was a tendency among the official of the state not to 'secure Kashmir for Kashmiris, still less for the British, but for Punjabis and other Indians' (Younghusband 1908). The Punjabis were adept at Urdu, the language of schooling and the lower domains of power all over North India, and kept increasing the use of the language in the apparatus of the state. This role of the Punjabis has been pointed out by some authors. It is reported, for instance, that in 1888, earlier than the official date of the changeover, Bhag Rae and other Punjabi officials started using Urdu in official documents (Sarwari 1993, Vol. 1: 3).

The role of the Punjabis in Kashmir is similar to that of the 'Hindustanis'—people from the Urdu-speaking urban areas of North India—in the Hyderabad state. In Hyderabad, as we have seen, the Persian-using local ruling elite were also antagonistic to the new linguistic incursion but eventually succumbed to it. And in Kashmir too the same thing happened. The Kashmiri Pandits changed their strategy for retaining their power by learning Urdu and, of course, English.

HINDU-MUSLIM POLITICS AND LANGUAGE

Urdu served several political interests of the rulers. First, it was foreign for all communities and, therefore, the rulers could not be accused of imposing their own language upon such diverse linguistic groups as composed by the state. Second, Urdu was associated with the Muslim identity in India. Hence, the rulers, who were not Muslims themselves, could fend off any attempt by Muslim politicians to create an oppositional power block along linguistic lines. Thirdly, it tended to give a kind of unity to the literate classes and opened up avenues for employment for Kashmiris in North India and vice versa.

Even the Urdu-Hindi controversy, which was sweeping across India, did not affect the Kashmir state much. According to the Census of 1911:

> The political agitation on the Urdu and Hindi question so acute all over the plains of India, has had but a feeble echo in this state, and has undoubtedly operated to vitiate the accuracy of Census returns relating to literacy in Urdu and Hindi to a certain though very small, extent... (Census-K 1912 Part 1: 164).

This was because Urdu was not a Muslim preserve in the State. It was used 'equally by the members of all communities who can lay any claim to literacy (Ibid., 164). Indeed, even in 1921, the

Muslims were much behind the Hindus in literacy in any language. The Census report of 1921 reports:

> The Musalmans have added 4 persons to every 1,000 of their literate population during the last ten years, but they still present a sad contrast to their Hindu brethren as 988 Musalmans out of 1,000 are still unable to read and write (Census-K 1923: 111).

The proportion of Hindus versus Muslims of Urdu-knowing persons out of 1000 being 22 and 5 (Ibid., 115), the Muslims could lay no special claim to Urdu.

However, some of the language-based antagonism in the rest of India did spill over into Kashmir also. In 1936, for instance, the Hindus wanted the Devanagari script to replace the Perso-Arabic script of Urdu to write the language used in official documents in Kashmir. The National Conference of Sheikh Abdullah, however, opposed this move. In 1939, Khwaja Ghulam us Saideen headed a report on the medium of instruction. It concluded that Urdu was established as the language of schooling and the common language of all Kashmiris (Kaefvi 1979: 121–122). However, by now, democratic rhetoric had injected some sensitivity—at least on the surface level—towards the other languages of the state. Thus, it was decreed that the laws adopted by the State Legislative Assembly 'shall be published in the Urdu language, as well as the language of the nationalities of the state'. (Teng et al. 1977: 487). The court proceedings too would be in Urdu but in the lower courts in 'the local language' (Ibid., 491). The documents from 1942 declare 'Kashmiri, Dogri, Balti (Pali), Dardic, Punjabi, Hindi' as the languages of Kashmir while Urdu was to 'be the lingua franca of the state' (Ibid., 493). In short, Sheikh Abdullah's National Conference did not change the Maharajah's policy of retaining Urdu as the official language of the state.

URDU AFTER 1947

After 1947 the situation did not change much. English continued to be used at the highest level; Urdu was the official language and the lingua franca while the local languages were used informally. However, in 1954 it was promised, in the report relating to citizenship and fundamental rights, that 'the state shall foster and encourage the growth and development of State and regional languages...' (Teng et al. 1977: 614). The Constitution of the State (1950) merely endorsed the role of English and Urdu while promising to develop the 'other regional languages specified in the Sixth Schedule' (Ibid., 629).

The resistance to Urdu in Kashmir was not on religious lines as it was in the rest of India during the Hindi-Urdu controversy and even now. Indeed, according to Zutshi, the promotion of Urdu at the expense of Kashmiri, went against the Muslim masses of Kashmir. The educational institutions 'were creating a gap between education and the public sphere, defined largely by publications in Kashmiri, which is perhaps the reason why the educational reform movements had such minimal impact on the Muslim masses' (Zutshi 2004: 189). The Pandits, according to Zutshi, became supporters of 'Kashmir for Kashmiris movement' (Ibid., 190). Kashmiri was conceded by the state but only as a medium of instruction for girls 'and even in this case it was never implemented' (Zutshi 2004: 195).

The experiment referred to by Zutshi took place in the 1950s and was supposed to take place in schools from class 1 to 5. Kashmiri was to be the medium of instruction as well as a subject of study, but the experiment was discontinued 'on the lame excuse of a clumsy script' (Pushp 1996: 23). According to some observers, this neglect of Kashmiri is because the Muslim leaders of Kashmir were mostly educated at Aligarh and regard Urdu as a symbol of Muslim cultural identity (Warikoo 1996: 209). However, Urdu is opposed in Ladakh by the Buddhists who regard it as an 'imposition' according to the report of *the Triennial*

Report of Kashmir Raj Bodhi Maha Sabha (1935. Quoted from Warikoo 1996: 200, also see Behera 2000: 216).

Another force against Urdu is its association with Pakistan. This, according to one author, is the reason that English is patronized so much. Thus, in Ladakh and Jammu 'all the official correspondence in educational institutions, courts and offices is being carried [on] in English' (Ansari 1996: 172). This could also be because of the anti-Urdu bias in these areas even before Pakistan was created and, in any case, Urdu is an alien language—as the Ladakhi report points out above—in these areas.

Yet another reason could be the usefulness of English as a tool for social mobility. Urdu is of no use for educated Kashmiris outside the state. Hindi in the Devanagari script is far more useful all over North India. And for jobs in the higher domains of power, not only in India but all over the world, it is English which has the greatest value. As such, pragmatic considerations force young Kashmiris to aspire to learn English in preference to both Urdu and Kashmiri. However, because the state still uses Urdu, they have to learn Urdu also. In any case, an alternative to Urdu is hard to find under the circumstances. Kashmiri is not only even more ghettoizing than Urdu in India but also confined to the Vale of Kashmir. Ladakhi and Dogri, besides having very little literature and documents in them, are also confined to Ladakh and Jammu. Hindi in the Devanagari script would probably not be acceptable to the Muslim community of Kashmir. In short, Urdu remains the compromise solution for all communities in Kashmir despite some opposition to it.

SMALLER MUSLIM STATES

While very large Muslim states, like Hyderabad, were almost like independent countries and, therefore, somewhat isolated from Indian politics, the smaller states were immediately influenced by it. Thus, Bhopal, Rampur and Tonk—all in the Hindi belt—were much more influenced by the Hindi-Urdu politics than Hyderabad

was. For instance, the census of 1931 says that the language returns were 'coloured by immediate politics' all over North India. In Bhopal 'Urdu was returned...to give effect to a sentiment that Hindus as well as Muslims living in that state ought to have the peculiarly Muslim Variety of Hindustani as their mother-tongue instead of Rajasthani and even instead of Gondi' (Census-I 1933: 349). As mentioned earlier, after independence the Urdu-speakers declined while Hindi-speakers increased substantially. Moreover, many people stopped using the label 'Hindustani' for their languages opting for 'Hindi' instead which, of course, swelled the number of the latter (Census M.P. 1954: 74).

In Rampur, Urdu replaced Persian as the official language during the reign of Nawab Mushtaq Ali Khan (1887–1889) (Islahi 2004: 22). *The Gazetteer of the Rampur State* (1911) records Urdu as the language of official business in the state (Rampur 1911: 44–46) and connects this with the presence of Muslims commenting that 'it is only natural that they should be able to speak Urdu with accuracy and fluency' (Rampur 1911: 44). The state also had a press since 1870 which published an Urdu weekly newspaper called the *Dabdabā-ē-Sikandarī*.

In Tonk, surrounded as it was by Rajput states, Urdu was used for official business (Anjuman 1940: 150). The Muslim *nawabs* patronized Muslim heritage languages and Urdu literature.

Coming now to the states in the areas now in Pakistan, the two largest ones were Bahawalpur and Kalat.

In Bahawalpur, Urdu replaced Persian in 1835. The official proceedings used to be in Urdu though, out of habit, people kept petitioning the state in Persian (see a letter of 18 June 1892 in Shahab 1992: 18). It is important to note that the State did not shift to Punjabi (the Riasati variety of it now called Siraiki). In the Patiala State, also Punjabi-speaking, Maharajah Bhupindra Singh, issued a royal decree on 4 June 1911 that the Punjabi language written in the Gurmukhi script was to be used in the state. In 1942 the state also made the teaching of Punjabi

compulsory in primary and middle schools (Singh n.d.: 15–17). But in Bahawalpur, Muslim political and cultural inclination towards Urdu made it appear natural that Persian would be succeeded by Urdu not Siraiki.

In Kalat the court language remained Persian but one finds letters and other documents in Urdu (Kausar 1986 a). Newspapers, theatre, educational institutions, and printed material kept spreading Urdu in Balochistan (Kausar 1986 b). Moreover, the construction of cantonments and the proximity of British Urdu-using territory, brought in people well-versed in Urdu to the state which popularized the language.

Coming now to the Hindu states of Rajputana, these states speak varieties of Hindi (in the sense of the sum total of all its varieties) but most of them, at one time or the other, did use Persian and then Urdu as official languages. The Hindi-Urdu controversy affected many of them to shift to the Devanagari script for official work. Correspondence with the British was, of course, in English. The Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu carried out a survey of these states in the 1930s. This survey has given details of the language situation and how the efforts of Hindi activists, like Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, brought about the shift from Urdu to Hindi (he begged the ruler as a Brahmin for this in Bekanir. See Anjuman 1940: 223). But the Anjuman makes a distinction between language and script. Thus, all the court documents are transliterated from the Devanagari to the Perso-Arabic script and show the same Persianized diction, which similar documents have when written in places where the language is called Urdu. But the language of documents, conservative as it is, is not the only indicator of the actual language in use. The fact is that, probably on account of the pressure of language politics around them, these states shifted to Hindi, notwithstanding the Anjuman's desire to prove otherwise. In any case, though Persian was used in them in certain official domains, it never had deep cultural roots (Bayly

1966: 300). Thus it was as easy and natural for them to make the transition to Hindi as it was for the Muslim states to Urdu.

To conclude, the politics of language in the native states depended on a number of factors. In the small states in North India where the rulers were Hindus, the imperatives of identity politics, in common with British India, brought in Hindi in place of Urdu or Persian. In the large states of Hyderabad and Kashmir, however, the politics of the inhabitants of the state (*mulkī*) and outsiders (*ghair mulkī*) played the determining role. In both cases Persian was replaced by Urdu helping the outsiders consolidate their power in the state at the expense of the inhabitants. In Hyderabad the transition to Urdu came at a time when Urdu became a symbol of Muslim identity and it made the state a pioneer in the use of Urdu as a medium of instruction and a language of administration. However, this came at the cost of squeezing the space for the local languages of the state. In Kashmir the language brought unity at the upper level while depriving the common people, Muslim, Hindu and Buddhists, of their native languages. Ironically, despite the subcontinent-wide association of Urdu with the Muslim identity, this association remains less powerful than Muslim or Kashmiri identity. But let us now turn to two institutions which played a major role in constructing identities: education and printing. First, let us take education.

NOTE

1. The Nizams who actually ruled were the first seven; the last in the line carried the title until 1971 but did not rule: 1) Mir Qamruddin Khan Nizam ul Mulk Asaf Jah I (r. 1724–48); 2) Mir Nizam Ali Khan Asaf Jah II (r. 1762–1803); 3) Mir Akbar Ali Khan Sikandar Jah III (r. 1803–29); 4) Mir Farkhunda Ali Khan Nasiruddaula Asaf Jah IV (r. 1829–57); 5) Mir Tahniyat Ali Khan Afzaluddaula Asaf Jah V (r. 1857–69); 6) Mir Mahboob Ali Khan Asaf Jah VI (r. 1869–1911); 7) Mir Osman Ali Khan Asaf Jah VII (r. 1911–50); 8) Mir Barkat Ali Khan Mukarram Jah Asaf Jah VIII (r. 1967–71).

<div align="right">**Annexure-A/9**</div>

THE STATE OF URDU IN THE RAJPUT STATES

Jaipur: Urdu was used in the courts of law. In 1884 the state had ordered that unfamiliar words of Arabic, Persian and English should not be used (Anjuman 1940: 37–38). However, Bayly says that in Jaipur, Hindi replaced Persian when it slipped out of the intellectual orbit of Delhi (Bayly 1996: 299).

Kishangarh: The Devanagari script is used but in some departments papers are written in Urdu in the Perso-Arabic script (Anjuman 1940: 79–81).

Jhalawar: Came in existence in 1899 and Urdu in its own script was used but in 1906, Hindi, in the Devanagari script, was substituted for it (Ibid., 89–91).

Bundi: Urdu and Persian words were not allowed to be used (Ibid., 107–108).

Kota: In 1911 Hindi in the Devanagari script came to be used instead of Urdu (Ibid., 123).

Tonk: Urdu was the language of administration and judiciary and schooling (Ibid.,150).

Qarauli: Farsi and then Urdu was the official language till 1930 (Ibid., 155). However, a document of 1913 is in the Devanagari script.

Bhartpur: In 1920 the Devanagari script came to be used (Ibid., 173).

Dholpur: In 1929 the Maharana allowed both scripts and in 1937 the Hindi words came to be used (Ibid., 183–184).

Alwar: In 1910 the ruler substituted Hindi for Urdu (Ibid., 195).

Bekanir: In 1912, on Pandit Malaviya's request, Urdu was changed to Hindi (Ibid., 223).

Jodhpur: Urdu was used. Subsequently Marvari and then Devanagari scripts came to be used in 1890 (Ibid., 239). The language remained the same.

Udaipur: Urdu language and script were never used (Ibid., 255).

Banswara: Urdu was never used (Ibid., 273).

Sirohi: Urdu in the Devanagari script is used. Some officials, however, kept using the Perso-Arabic script till 1933 (Ibid., 288).

Ajmer: Hindi is the first language (Ibid., 297).

Source: Anjuman 1940.

10

Urdu as the Language of Employment

Under the Pathan rulers, according to Momin Mohiuddin, 'Hindi was recognised as a semi-official language under the Súrs and the chancellery receipts bore the transcription in the Dévanágarí Script of the Persian contents, a practice which is said to have been introduced by the Lódís' (Mohiuddin 1971: 28). Indeed, it is said that 'the registers of all revenue accounts were kept in Hindi' under the Sultans, and it has been mentioned earlier that it was Todar Mal who ordered that they should be kept in Persian during Akbar's reign (28th Regnal year) (Ibid., 38). But even then some offices and terms dealing with administration and revenue continued to be in Hindi. Thus the glossary of a book on the orders (*farmāns*) of the Mughals has words used even now by revenue officers in Pakistan such as: *Banjar* (barren); *chak* (consolidated area of land; village); *chaklā* (sub division of a district); *chaudhary* (headman); *chauth* (one-fourth); *chungī* (cess or octroi); *patvārī* (keeper of records), etc. (Khan 1994: 91–101).

Thus, despite the official use of Persian by the Mughals in the business of the state, Urdu-Hindi diction permeated the lower levels of employment. The Hindu Kaesth class and the Muslims who knew Persian, monopolized the bureaucracy and the judiciary not only under the Mughal emperors but also in the princely states scattered all over India. The story of how some of these princely states—especially the two large states of Hyderabad and Kashmir—switched over from Persian to Urdu in official domains has been narrated earlier. This chapter focuses on the way Urdu functioned as the language of employment in

the present-day UP and the Punjab. Other parts of the Hindi belt, such as Bihar and what is now called Madhya Pradesh, will be touched upon in passing, in order to contrast the language situation there from the areas where Urdu was the language of public and private jobs, but they are not the focus of this chapter.

It should, of course, be mentioned that the kind of employment referred to here excludes the domains covered in other chapters, namely education, printing and publication, media, and entertainment. It also excludes the higher levels of the domains dealt with here, (i.e. judiciary, administration, police, army, revenue, and other services) which functioned in English. The private job market—such as that of advertising (Bhatia and Baumgardner 2008)—is touched upon in passing. The focus, therefore, in on the lower bureaucracy in present-day UP and the Punjab.

The British created the modern bureaucratic structures which functioned in English at the higher level and several recognized vernacular languages at the lower ones. The higher courts of law functioned in English, but when the Warren Hastings Judicial Plan of 1772 was put in place in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, 'the technical terms used in the courts were all in Urdu, such as *moffussil*, *faujdari*, and *dewani*' (Bhatia and Sharma 2008: 365). The *Adalat System* had courts of appeal called the *Sadar Nizamat Adalat* and the *Sadar Diwani Adalat.* 'In 1780 another change was made in which *Diwani Adalat* was presided by an English judge, who was assisted by native law officers'(Bhatia and Sharma 2008: 365). These structures functioned in languages which, in another context, have been called the languages of the salariat (Rahman 2002a: 97–128). As it happened, in British India these salariats— in Hamza Alavi's terms (1987: 68)—were the competing Hindu and Muslim educated elites who sought employment. Thus, except at the very highest level, which functioned in English, the fact that Urdu was the language of the workplace mattered

significantly. If it was, certain pressure groups—mostly the Muslims and the Hindu Kaesths in North India—stood to gain. If it was not, these groups were forced out of jobs, unless they re-educated themselves, and their rivals found entry in the same positions.

The story of the replacement of Persian by the vernaculars of India has been narrated several times (King 1994: 56–63; Rahman 1996: 36–37; Rahman 2002: 145–153) and need not detain us here. However, the shift to the indigenous languages of India had been going on since 1798 when an official 'Resolution of the Board' from Fort William declared that for the 'office of Judge or Registrar of any Court of Justice, in the Provinces of Bengal, Behar, Orissa or Benares, the Hindoostanee and the Persian languages' will be required (21 December 1798 in Siddiqi 1963: 72).

The point to note about the final replacement of Persian is that it was not replaced by any one language but several of them. Whereas in present-day UP and the Punjab it was replaced by Urdu in the Perso-Arabic script, there were several areas in the Hindi belt where it was replaced by Hindi in the Devanagari and even in the Kaithi scripts. In the Saugur and Nerbudda Territories (mostly present-day MP) and in the hill districts of the NWP, for instance, it was replaced by Hindi in the Devanagari script. The person who took this initiative was F.J. Shore who, in 1835, ordered his subordinate officials to learn the Devanagari script. He then ordered the use of the Devanagari script in the courts and other official business. Among his reasons for doing so was that the officials from the NWP, who now controlled the major share of government jobs, would be replaced by local officials (King 1994: 60). However, the Persian-using subordinates of Shore resisted the change so much that petitions kept being written in the Perso-Arabic script. He then found out what had happened and describes this as follows:

> I discovered that the Amlah [court officials] and Petition Writers who were connected with the former had given out that although the Language might be Oordoo [Urdu] the character must be Persian, in order to preserve their monopoly (Sir John Shore's Letter to the Sadr Board of Revenue, 16 September 1836. Quoted from King 1994: 61).

Those wishing to preserve their monopoly over government jobs were not only Muslims. Indeed, in this part of India they were mostly educated Hindus of the Kaesth class. And, as the officers themselves came from Urdu-using areas, the pressure of this lobby increased so much that the use of Devanagari decreased and that of the Perso-Arabic script increased by the time the Central Provinces (CP) were created from these areas in 1861.

The battle for the language of employment did not end in CP in the 1860s, however. Gradually the demand for Hindi grew and in 1872 the Government of India allowed Hindi to be used in nine districts—the others used vernaculars anyway—in official business in the courts, the revenue and the police offices. But this was merely a permissive order and the officials found ways of getting around it. Eventually they settled down for writing the same Persianized language which was used in the NWP but in the Devanagari script (King 1994: 71).

Another attempt to use Hindi in the Devanagari script was in Bihar in 1871. Here, Sir George Campbell, the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, heard a welcome address in his honour which was in such a flowery style of Persian that he decided to abolish Urdu and, in 1873, permitted the use of the Devanagari script as well as the Kaithi scripts in the courts and other official business. However, this too was only a permissive order which did not ban Urdu or even its script altogether (King 1994: 72–73). In 1880, however, Sir Ashley Eden ordered the exclusive use of the Devanagari or Kaithi scripts in Bihar to which Muslims objected vehemently. By this time, of course, the scripts of Urdu and Hindi were not only linked with jobs; they were also indexed to identities.

Let us now turn to the North Western Provinces where Urdu was the language of employment.

In a letter from the secretary of the Local Committee of Public Instruction to W. Muir, secretary to the Government of the NWP, dated 10 February 1854, states the following conditions for government employment in the North Western Provinces:

A person seeking government employment should be able to:

a. Read the ordinary *shakista* handwriting as the Urdu papers presented in the courts were in this.
b. To translate from English to Urdu.
c. To write an order if the heads are told verbally in Urdu.
d. To 'write a clear, good, quick *shakista* hand' (Edn. NWP 1854: LXV of Appendix J).

These requirements facilitated the Muslim and the Kaesths in these areas.

A *patvari* was supposed to know both Urdu and Hindi by the order of 10 August 1854, by the Saddar Board, unless he served in Kamaun or the Saugar and Nerbudda territories (Taleem 1854 a: 6) A list of all *Patvaris* who knew Urdu was maintained in the district office (Taleem 1854 b: 11). The Collector could order that *patvaris* and *numberdars*—the latter ordinarily knowing Hindi—learn Urdu (Ibid., 3–4).

In 1872 the Government of India enquired into the conditions of employment of Muslims. The officers who sent in their reports, invariably considered the language of public employment when reporting upon the issue. Even in Bengal, where the local language was predominantly Bengali, Hindustani was considered important in the early 1800s as the following letter suggests:

Of three languages current on the Bengal side of India, the Persian and Hindustanee are necessary for the transaction of business in all

offices' (Directors' letter to 'Our Governor-General, at Fort William in Bengal', 27 Jan 1802 in Public 1811: 61).

Indeed, it was believed that Bengali was necessary only for the provincial collectors (Ibid., 61). All officers, and even their wives, 'needed the common Hindustanee, or colloquial dialect' (Ibid., 60). However, when Bengali did become the official language of the lower domains of government employment, Muslims did lose jobs (Edn. Emp 1886: 239).

In the Bombay presidency the Muslims, either being uneducated or educated only in Muslim heritage languages, did not qualify for employment (Ibid., 264). In the NWP and Oudh, however, the Muslims were preponderant (34.78 per cent) in official jobs as the public offices functioned in Urdu and in the Punjab, too, there was no disadvantage for them. However, their overall level of participation in education was lower than that of Hindus. Even so, a member of the Punjab University Senate, a certain C. Boulnois, said that more respect should be given to 'Urdu and other Eastern languages in our courts and public offices by our officers both judicial and executive' where English is given too much importance (Ibid., 212).

The Hunter's Commission entertained many memorials, bringing out the significance of language for employment. For instance, a memorial about Muslim education claimed that the ousting of Persian as well as the order of 1864 that English alone should be the language of examination for the more coveted appointments in the subordinate civil service had ruined their chances of finding suitable employment (Edn. Com NWP and O 1884: 497). That the order substituting Hindi in the Devanagari script in Bihar still rankled with them, also found expression. However, the Lieutenant Governor did not withdraw that order but he did agree that the B.A. examination—which required proficiency in English—could be substituted by some other means of evaluation (Ibid., 498–499).

Education was invariably linked with employment as many education reports, some referred to in the chapter on education, have brought out. Even as late as 1873–74 an education report comments on the Persian schools as follows:

> The Persian schools owed their existence, in the first instance, to the wants of the Mahomedan regime, and they serve the same practical purpose now in supplying scribes acquainted with the style and technicalities of the British Kachahri language (Edn. NWP 1874: 23).

The whole Hindi-Urdu controversy, sometimes referred to as the 'Language Question' by British officers, is attributed—as by Kempson, DPI of the NWP in 1874—as 'an agitation [of the Hindus] against the use of Urdu in courts and districts' (Edn. NWP 1874: 137).

This was, as the officers pointed out repeatedly, because Urdu is used 'in the transaction of official business' in the present-day UP (and the Punjab) area (Edn. NWP and O 1886: 18). The reason most aspiring young men took the vernacular Middle Examination in Urdu rather than Hindi was the same. As a report puts it:

> Hindi being of very little use in the Government Courts, and Urdu being quite indispensable, no doubt could arise as to which form of the vernacular was likely to gain upon the other in an examination which is declared to be the test for Government employment (Edn. NWPL and O 1892: 29).

The report of 1893–94 not only repeats this but adds that the preference for Urdu will remain 'so long as the cause of this circumstance remains' (i.e. as long as it is used in public offices) (Edn. NWP and O 1894: 48).

It was primarily to this privileged position of Urdu that the Hindi movement objected. Madan Mohan Malaviya's collection of documents called *Court Character and Primary Education in the*

N. W. Provinces and Oudh (1897), demonstrates what everybody already knew—that the Urdu of the courts was almost like Persian which was the monopoly of Muslims and Hindu Kaesths. And indeed, as convincingly argued by Paul Brass, the Muslims of these areas were represented much more than their numbers warranted in all professions: army, police, public administration, law, education, etc (Brass 1974: 150–156). This, indeed, was one of the reasons Sir Antony MacDonnell, Lieutenant Governor of the North Western Provinces, allowed petitions in the Devanagari script to be received by official bodies. In his letter of 22 August 1897 to the Viceroy, Lord Elgin, he writes:

> Out of 240 Tehsildars 140 are Mahommedans. There are 2570 Mahommedan Police officers to 2120 Hindus. Have for the last 18 months been endeavouring to correct this preponderance and to establish a proportion of 5 Hindus to 3 Mahommedans (as the general population of the Hindus are to the Mahommedans as 7 to 1) (MacDonnell 1897).

In order to enable his officials to process documents in the Devanagari script, he wrote in a STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL 'Minute' to the Viceroy.

> I have recently recast the Departmental Examination... insisting on a better knowledge of both the Urdu and the Hindi language. This is for young ICS officers (MacDonnell 1901: 38).

He goes on to add that though the Muslims and the Kaesths resented his order—the optional use of Devanagari in official documents—it had 'already given a stimulus to Vernacular education' (MacDonnell 1901: 40).

However, though much reviled by the Muslim press as an enemy of Urdu and the Muslims, Sir Antony MacDonnell had not thrown Muslims completely out of employment. The *Pioneer* of

1 August 1900 sums up his record of giving employment as follows:

> ...out of 359 appointments he had made 177 have been Muslims and 182 Hindus in Deputy Collectors, Tehsildars, Naib Tehsildars and inspectors of police. In District Boards and Municipal Committees he appointed 122 Muslims against 141 Hindus.

However, the Muslims were highly incensed at MacDonnell's actions and complained of being squeezed out of public service (*The Muslim Chronicle* [Calcutta] 1 May 1897).

The Hindi movement not only objected to the script of Urdu but also to the diction of the official language. The proceedings of the British lower courts were recorded in Urdu and the settlement papers were written in the Urdu script, but in such a highly Persianized style that even educated people had to hire court officials to help them with the documents. Of course it was in the interest of the landowner (*zamīndār*) to learn the language so as to be less dependent on the professionals as many stories in Urdu promoted by the British pointed out. However, on the whole the system was very complex as the lowest rung of the land revenue system (the *patvārī*) recorded transactions in Hindi. Moreover, they also used the Kayethi, Sarrafi or Mahajani script for it rather than the Devanagari one which the British wanted to promote.

But Persian had acquired great cultural capital in the nearly six hundred years of its ascendancy. This cultural capital remained even after the British substituted Urdu for Persian as the language of the lower courts, the police and the revenue service in a major part of North India. Thus, anyone who knew this language—the language of the courts or *kutcherī*—carried not only social prestige but also a saleable skill which was the monopoly of Muslim clerks, priests and the Kaesths. Let us now discuss this special register which consists almost entirely of words of Persian and Arabic origin which do have Hindi-Urdu

equivalents but which, nevertheless, continues to be used in official documents and which some British officials and members of the Hindi movement found so objectionable.

Babu Siva Prasad, a moderate member of the Hindi movement, said that when Persian was substituted by Urdu as the language of the court the Kaesths put in only Hindi verbs while retaining the nouns and other terms of Perso-Arabic (Prasad 1868: 18–19). Babu Haris Chandra, another supporter of Hindi, made a forceful complaint against the pedantry of the legal terminology. Some of his examples are as follows:

Indivisible:	*ghair mumkin ul taqsīm*
One fourth:	*rub'ā*
Declaration of occupancy:	*Istiqrār-ē-haq-ē-muqābizāt-ē-kāshtkārānā*

He wanted them to be removed from the lexicon of the courts (Edn. Com NWP and O 1884: 200–202).

It appears though, that the Perso-Arabic diction was seen as being iconic of Muslim identity and, like the Sanskritic diction in Hindu discourse, it drew the boundaries of the 'self' and the 'other'. For instance when a certain Perkins, an assistant commissioner of Delhi, sent a manual for using easy Urdu in the courts the Anjuman-i Punjab decided not to use it. Among other reasons, the Anjuman said that the identity of Urdu was based upon the use of Arabic and Persian words 'otherwise how could Urdu be distinguished from Hindi... (*varnā Hindī ō Urdū mē̃ kyā farq ō īmtiāz hō sakē gā*)' (Anjuman. P 1866: 7).

Javed Majeed, after a study of the legal petitions of the 1860s points out that there 'is a predilection for using Persian plurals for human beings rather than Urdu plurals'. The examples he gives are '*Sakinān* (inhabitants), *bandegān* (servants), *gavāhān* (witnesses), *namāziyan* (those who pray), *dokhterān* (daughters), *mālikān* (owners), *Pesarān* (sons) and *vārisān* (heirs)' (Majeed 1995: 189). He also points out other Persian usages, both grammatical

and discursive, which entered the so-called 'Urdu' of the courts (Ibid., 189–199).

The subject of the register of the courts of law was debated among British officials as well as the proponents of Arabo-Persianized Urdu and Sanskritized Hindi. J. Beames, for instance, defended the Urdu of the courts on the grounds that the Perso-Arabic diction is exact, rich, and intelligible through usage in proportion to one's level of education, and that this process is parallel to that which has made English such a rich language. On the contrary, he claims, borrowings from Sanskrit, which would replace the 'Arabic element', would be unintelligible (Beames 1866: 1–13). He was refuted by F.S. Growse who argued that the objection was to Perso-Arabic diction for which there were intelligible and commonly used Hindi (i.e. Hindi-Urdu) equivalents and not to all terms from these sources. On the whole, his plea was for moderation and intelligibility and in the end he warned against the use of a language which 'robs the Hindus of their most glorious literary inheritance' (Growse 1866: 181). But the strange '*Kutcherry* jargon' remained as the prized cultural capital of the service elite.

This is not true only of the 1860s but even of Urdu documents in courts and police and revenue departments of present-day Pakistan where the Arabic *walad* or the Persian *pisar* is used for the Urdu *bētā* (son), and half is still the Persian *nisf* rather than the Urdu *ādhā* and so on. Indeed, even in Rajputana, although the script of all the court documents in the 1940s was Devanagari, the diction was the same Perso-Arabic one which one finds in other areas (Anjuman 1940). The Punjab samples of courts documents from the 1860s are in the same language and, in this case, in the Perso-Arabic script (Aslam 1991). Such documents also exist in such far-flung areas of the empire as Balochistan (Kausar 1986 b). And the heart of the empire—present-day UP and the city of Delhi—was the citadel of Persianized court language. It had penetrated these domains so much that even in

modern India, where Sanskritized Hindi holds sway, the courts use a special jargon which, according to Bhatia and Sharma, still includes the following leftovers from history.

> These expressions are part of the mixed code, which is illustrated in items such as the following: *Dafa* 302 (Section 302), *Taje Rate Hind* (Indian Pernal Code), *muwakkil* (client), *vakilatnamah* (lawyer's form), *halafnama* (affidavit), *banam* (versus), *vald* (son of), *muddaiya* (plaintiff), *muddailaya* (defendant), and *patwari muharrir* (government officers) (Bhatia and Sharma 2008: 369).

All of these terms are used in Pakistan as mentioned above. The point, therefore, is that the lower officials never stopped using the Persian they were familiar with to ensure continuity of their traditional monopoly, their pride in a jargon they understood best and to remain inscrutable and pompous as all bureaucracies tend to do. With this kind of cultural capital available in Persian and Urdu schools, it is little wonder that it was only after partition that some part of this diction was dropped in India in favour of even more esoteric Sanskritic diction but in Pakistan no change was made at all.

In India, as foretold by the more prescient British officers—such as John C. Nesfield, the DPI of Oudh—in the 1870s that if the court language were changed 'Urdu and Persian would gradually die out' (J. Sparks the Officiating Secretary of the Govt. to the DPI in his letter of 30 November 1874 in Edn. O 1874: 3), the script yielded to the Devanagari one. Surprisingly, however, despite Sanskritization of the official language, a few conventional legal terms continue to be throwbacks to the past as illustrated by the examples given above.

Apart from the judiciary, police and the administration, the British Indian army also used Hindustani but in the Roman script. However, during the 'mutiny' of 1857, the East India Company's soldiers and their comrades opposing the British also used Urdu. At the highest level—that of the King or the princes—

Persian was used. But otherwise the constitution of the 'mutineers' was in Urdu (Siddiqi 1966: 282), commanders and even Bakht Khan, the commander-in-chief of the Indian troops, passed orders in it (Ibid., 298; 317). Even the seal of Lakshmi Bai, the Rani of Jhansi carried her name in Urdu (Ibid., 388).

But this was a matter of a little more than a year. When the British regained control of India, they continued using Urdu in the Roman script as before. For instance, Frank Lugard Brayne (1882–1952) Adviser on Indian Affairs, Indian Army (1941–46), says:

> Armies must have a common language and the Indian Army uses Urdu for all enlisted men whatever their home language (Brayne 1945: n. page).

He advocates the use of the Roman script but Indian, and not British, pronunciation of Urdu.

Yet another letter tells us that Urdu, sometimes also called Hindustani in the same papers, written in the Roman script, had been in use in the army since 1914, i.e. the First World War. Indeed, it was supposed to be the lingua franca of the Army. However, the way Roman Urdu was written was not accurate, despite the fact that Gilchrist had written in the *Oriental Fabulist* (1803) that Indian languages could be written in the Roman script and had made a 'Hindi-Roman Orthographical Chart' for accuracy (Siddiqi 1963: 39–40). Roman Urdu was 'the language of command in the Indian Army' in 1942 when Ralph Russell, later a pioneer and champion of teaching Urdu in the UK, arrived in India as an army officer (Russell 1996: 5). The Indian Army Lower examination at this time was entirely in this script though higher examinations were not (Ibid., 6). In order to create accuracy, changes were introduced several times. During this period Brigadier F.L. Brayne was the moving spirit behind introducing the new changes. He first conceded that there were imperfections and then suggested changes.

Roman Urdu used by the Army is only 65% accurate. By a few small changes it could be made 99% accurate, and still could be typed and printed without any alterations or additions to the type fonts and typewriters (Brayne 1945: n. page).

These changes were circulated both to military and civilian officers (Brayne NO. 100677/WD. (Advsr). He wanted the army to adopt them and felt that the civilian bureaucracy would follow: On 24 October 1945 he says.

The Army should go its own way, as it has hitherto. If the revised system is good enough the civil will begin to nibble [Brayne 1945. No. 100672/WG (Advsr/.Z].

Roman Urdu was also taught and used in the Pakistan Army, at least till the fifties, because officers commissioned in the sixties say that it had been discontinued during their time (Durrani Int. 2010).

However, the use of Urdu in the Perso-Arabic script has increased in the armed forces of Pakistan, although the officer corps still operates in English. For instance, instead of English words of command, Urdu and Bengali terms were introduced in the Pakistan Military Academy (PMA) in 1970 (personal observation). After the emergence of Bangladesh in 1971, the Bengali words were removed and only the Urdu part (albeit Persianized) remained. In his book on the use of Urdu in the Pakistan Army, Colonel Ghulam Jilani Khan gives several suggestions to increase this usage: improvement in the already published military dictionary which provides equivalents of military terms; translation of training manuals in Urdu; courses in military Urdu; publication of journals, or parts of them in Urdu; the provision of Urdu typing facilities; teaching of Urdu in PMA and so on (Khan 1989: 76–77). If all of these suggestions are accepted there will be many more jobs for people with skills in Urdu than ever before.

As for the use of Urdu in the civilian government, in addition to being used at the lower levels in the revenue and judicial services in most of Pakistan—only in parts of Sindh the Sindhi language is used in these domains—and also serves as the official language of the former Jammu and Kashmir State now indirectly administered by Pakistan (called Azad Jammu and Kashmir). The Government of Pakistan has promised to make it the official language of the country several times. The 1973 Constitution states:

> The National language of Pakistan is Urdu, and arrangements shall be made for its being used for official and other purposes within fifteen years from the commencing day (Article 251, a).

The National Language Authority, created to facilitate the above, now possesses an adequate stock of terms in Urdu which, according to two of its recent chairmen—Fateh Mohammad Malik and Iftikhar Arif—will enable it to be used in the bureaucracy, education and other domains of employment (see NLA 2006 for terms to be used in official work). As neologism—the creation of new terms—has already been discussed in the context of the major languages of Pakistan (for Urdu see Rahman 1999: 265–267), it will not be dealt with here. Suffice it to say that accounts of the process and the ideology behind these efforts are adequately described by Waheed Uddin Saleem (1921) for the pre–1947 period and by Atash Durrani (1993) for the present era in Pakistan.

However, English still remains the language of the higher domains of power in Pakistan and, while letters from the offices of institutions specifically devoted to Urdu may be in that language, English is used by most other high offices. Parliamentary publications are, however, increasingly in Urdu in addition to English. Thus employment for translators has increased. The National Language Authority has recommended the use of Urdu in the examinations for recruitment to the civil service, has

trained government functionaries in the use of Urdu and reports that the language is being used in many domains—oath-taking, functions and receptions, parliament, certain offices—through its efforts even now (NLA 2005a). Otherwise, a study like S. Dwivedi's study of the use of Hindi in India entitled *Hindi on Trial* (1981), will show that while contracts, agreements, licences, tender notices, tender forms and letters might have increased in Urdu—as they have for Hindi in India (Dwivedi 1981: 131)—the main language for lucrative and powerful employment in both countries remains English. The tendency in both countries is for the elite to find employment through skills in English while other languages—including Urdu in the case of Pakistan—follow behind as far as lower middle-class and some middle class jobs are concerned.

In the private sector Urdu is used, apart from the domains of education, printing and the media, which will be dealt with later, in advertising, marketing, wall-chalking, calligraphy, and writing decorative inscriptions and epigraphs. As in India, wall advertising is in multiple languages and mixed scripts (Bhatia and Baumgardner 2008: 388). While in India the Lipton advertisement is in Hindi, Urdu and English and in three scripts— Devanagari, Perso-Arabic and Roman—in Pakistan it is in Urdu and English. However, there are a few advertisements which mix lines in Sindhi, Pashto and Punjabi, along with Urdu and English. While in India the socio-psychological motivations for multiple mixing, in the case of Persian-Urdu, are their association with luxury, royal and medieval romance and Islamic culture (Bhatia and Baumgardner 2008: 392). In Pakistan the language is associated with indigenousness, intimacy and, if some high-flown Urdu verse is on display, with medieval romance and tradition. Urdu is also the major language of inscriptions on Pakistani trucks which are highly decorated and transport goods from one end of the country to another. Urdu is the language of 75 per cent of these inscriptions (Rahman 2010: 277). It is also the main

language of inscriptions on gravestones, even in non-Urdu-speaking areas and even graffiti in toilets. This means that artists, calligraphers, painters, and purveyors of quotable quotes and popular inscriptions find employment of some kind for this kind of writing.

In short, because of its use in the lower domains of power, Urdu became a commodity in much demand in a major part of North India in its own script. In these domains this demand remains to this day in Pakistan, though it has shrunk considerably in India. As for writing in the Roman script it became the desiderated language of the army and nowadays functions in modern means of communication.

However, because it was the passport for lower-level public sector employment, it was resisted by the supporters of Hindi in the Devanagari script, who competed for the same jobs. Thus, the British policy of promoting Urdu as the language of employment in Hindu dominated areas fed into the consolidation of the competing communal identities in British India which resulted in antagonism which lives on till date.

11

Urdu in Education

Almost all scholars writing on the Hindi-Urdu controversy have indirectly touched upon the teaching of Urdu. Lelyveld (1978: 70) mentions the experiment of establishing rural schools at the primary level by James Thomason (1804–1853), Lieutenant Governor of the North Western Provinces, during the 1850s. Till then, it would appear, Hindustani was 'chiefly a colloquial language' and was 'seldom written even in transaction of business' (Adam 1835: 79). But once this policy was enforced, which will be discussed in some detail subsequently, the teaching of Urdu and Hindi fed into the mobilization of the competing Muslim and Hindu communal identities as described by many scholars notably Christopher King (1994); Francesca Orsini (2002: 89–124); Krishna Kumar (1991) who have focused more on the Hindu identity and Hindi educational institutions, processes and materials. The present author also describes the teaching of Urdu to the British as well as the Indians synoptically in his earlier book *Language, Ideology and Power* (Rahman 2002: 212–217), with reference to the same factors for the Muslims of North India. The following chapter expands upon these earlier works in order to explore more fully the social and political repercussions of the use of Urdu as an educational language.

The focus of this chapter is the spread of Urdu in the domain of education in the areas which now constitute Uttar Pradesh (North Western Provinces and Oudh) and the Punjab. The first is the area where the identity politics of Hindus and Muslims played a major role in creating communal antagonism between

these two communities leading to Muslim separatism. The second is the backbone of present-day Pakistan; the guardian of what is known in Pakistan as the 'two-nation theory'; and the major supporter of Urdu against the other languages of Pakistan. Other areas, such as the Bengal, will be mentioned in passing but these two parts of India will be used as case studies for the spread of Urdu as well as Hindi through education. Our focus will, of course, be on Urdu, though Hindi will be mentioned in order to understand the role of Urdu in education.

THE NORTH WESTERN PROVINCES

There were a number of indigenous schools in these areas when Lord Lake conquered them in 1803. In the Muslim schools, only the Quran was taught without understanding the language (Arabic) in which it was written. In the Hindi schools, mental arithmetic (tables) and a little writing in the *kaesthi* or *sarrafi* script were taught. The Sanskrit schools, or Patshalas, taught the Hindu religious texts in Sanskrit, while the Arabic schools, or madrassas, taught Muslim religious texts in Arabic and Persian. The Persian schools, however, taught Persian texts and, therefore, prepared their pupils for the public service as Persian was the language of official business.

But in the early 1840s, when the British first introduced Urdu and Hindi in government schools, both of these were not considered worthy of being learned formally in schools despite a considerable body of literature in them.

The Bengal Presidency education reports of the 1830s were mostly about the Bengal but they did allude briefly to Agra and other districts. The local committee at Agra says, for instance, that a Munshi should be hired for 'teaching the Musalman's colloquial dialect, entirely excluding Persian' (Edn. B 1837: 13). The report mentions both 'Hindui' and 'Urdu' and associates the first with the Hindus and the second with the Muslims (Ibid., 15). However, although Persian was being removed from the domains

of power, the report of 1839–40 says that Persian civilizes Kaesths and removing it will annoy Muslims (Edn. B 1841: 103–105). So, though Urdu was being taught in some places, the Indians (Kaesths and Muslims) of North India still thought of Persian as the desirable medium of instruction while the British, following Lord Auckland's Minute, gave that role to English, though it was more expensive to find teachers for it (Edn. B 1841: xvi-xxiii).

THE THOMASON EXPERIMENT

James Thomason (1804–1853), was the son of Thomas Thomason who was an East India Company's chaplain. The senior Thomason learned Arabic, Persian and Urdu in India and is said to have urged the Earl of Moira, then Governor General, to organize a system of national education in the vernaculars in India (Temple 1893: 27–29). His son, born in India but educated at Cambridge and Hailebury, actually made that dream come true. His intention, as he declared in his writings, was for peasants to be able to read in the vernaculars. Other company officers wanted Christianity to be taught but he refused to agree to this policy. Among other things, he is known for having initiated the experiment of creating village schools shared by several villages teaching both Urdu and Hindi (Temple 1893: 170–180).

The original scheme envisaged giving land to village school masters (15 to 10 acres) in all villages (79,033 of them). It was also proposed that 'no person shall be appointed school-master unless he fully understands, and is able to explain and give instruction in, Ram Surren Doss's four elementary books both Oordoo and Hindee' (Thornton 1846 in Selections 1856: 332). A second letter pursued the above ideas and suggested that the system will be introduced in eight districts to begin with, at a cost of Rs 36,000 and a Visitor General from the Indian Civil Service will be appointed to oversee its performance (Selections NWP 1856: 400–401). In a minute entitled 'Scheme for Promoting Vernacular Education' (Ibid., 403–405), it is proposed that the

District Visitor should know both Urdu and Hindi as should the 'pergunnah visitors' and the masters. The books, in both Hindi and Urdu, would also be sold through the District Visitor (Ibid., 404).

The first Visitor General was Henry Stewart Reid. He wrote four reports on indigenous education in vernacular schools in the districts of Agra, Aligarh, Bareli, Etawah, Farrukhabad, Mainpur, Mathura, and Shahjahanpur. These were cities with a substantial Muslim, as well as Hindu kaesth, presence. Both these elitist groups worked in Persian and considered it a class-marker. However, they were the ones chosen by the British authorities for transition to Urdu. By this time, 1853 onwards, the NWP Government had made the knowledge of Urdu necessary for employment. Among the conditions laid down were that (1) the candidate should be able to read the *Shakistā* handwriting as petitioners wrote in it (2) to translate from English to Urdu and (3) to 'write a clear, good quick *shikasta* hand' (Edn. NWP 1854: Appendix-J, p. LXV).

The first report of 1850–51 tells us that there were about 3,000 schools offering instruction to 25,000 children to begin with. These formed the basis of the British vernacular schools. By 1 May 1850, village teachers had been appointed and the schools had begun to function. They were classified according to location and, more to the point, according to the medium of instruction as follows:

Table 1		
Language-wise Schools in 1850		
Language	Schools	Scholars
Arabic	11	87
Arabic and Persian	157	1284
Kuran [sic]	109	821
Persian	1257	8503
Urdu	5	49
Urdu and Hindi	55	1781
Hindi	1259	10090
Hindi and Sanskrit	233	2845
Sanskrit	205	1561
English and vernacular	20	956
Source: Edn. Reid 1852: 12. The term 'Scholars' is used for pupils in the original.		

A school was not necessarily a building for formal instruction specifically built for this purpose. It was any place where the teacher and the taught came together. Thus, if a pious old man started teaching his own sons and those of his neighbours, it was a 'school'. Likewise, there were 'schools' in the houses of the affluent, offices of government officials and under banyan trees. The most prestigious of these schools were Persian schools. They were supported by Muslims and Kaesths. On the whole, the Persian teachers were considered as 'more intelligent, better paid, and more competent than the Hindi School Master' (Edn. Reid 1852: 17). The latter, it was reported, was often unable to read and was supported by the poorer agriculturists and lower businessmen (*baniyās*). The average pay of school teachers was Rs 4 per month which confined them to a working-class lifestyle (Edn. Reid 1852: 16–28).

For some time the term 'Persian teacher' covered teachers of Urdu also. In any case, Persian texts were taught through Urdu and the pupils knew the language as a medium of conversation. The challenge for the British was, however, to get Urdu accepted as a language of formal schooling. In some places, like Shahjahanpur and Bareli.

> ...The study of Persian is popular, and Urdu is proportionately looked down upon. Were Persian taught, numbers would attend. In the 14 Tahsili Schools in the Rohilkhand districts, very few boys are reading Hindi, whereas in all the remaining districts, Hindi scholars preponderate over Urdu (Edn. Reid 1852: 95).

However, such was the prestige of Persian that Urdu was not initially successful. The Report says:

> In the Tahsili Schools, the attempt has been made and till now has been persisted in, to introduce Urdu to the entire exclusion of Persian. A year's experience, however, forces the conviction that the experiment should be, for the present, abandoned. Many will not come near our Schools, who would gladly attend, were Persian also taught (Edn. Reid 1852: 113).

Even at Deoband, an Islamic madrassa which gave pride of place to Arabic, the 1284/1867–68 report conceded that if Persian were taught, people would send their young children to the madrassa and that might eventually create an interest in Arabic (Azhar 1985: 93). The British persisted, however, and offered incentives to Persian teachers who would teach Urdu (Ibid., 119). The students too were rewarded. Indeed, to wean them away from Persian and Sanskrit, rewards were offered only if they studied Urdu and Hindi (Ibid., 120). The district and sub-district (*parganāh*) visitors of schools, working under the Visitor General, but also reporting to the local district officer, were instructed to distribute funds at their command to increase the study of Urdu and Hindi rather than Arabic, Persian and Sanskrit. They were

specifically instructed to 'Persuade the School-Masters in Persian Schools to teach Urdu, and in Hindi Schools, to adopt the Nāgri in lieu of the Kāyasthī character, when the latter is prevalent' (Edn. Reid 1852: Appendix–1; 138–149).

These steps led to the introduction of Urdu in Persian schools in 1851–52 (Edn. Reid 1853: 59). Moreover, the Christian missionaries also taught Urdu in 'the Roman Character'. These schools—only two in number—also had female students (thirty-three of them) so that, for the first time, so many girls were getting formally educated in Urdu (Edn. Reid 1853: 59). By this time there seems to be some acceptance of Urdu as the *Report* says that people send their sons to the Persian schools so that they 'may acquire a thorough knowledge of Urdu' (Edn. Reid 1853: 88). Thus, in the sixty schools of the eight districts mentioned above, Urdu and Persian were read together (Ibid., 89). In other schools, such as the English-vernacular ones, Urdu and Hindi were taught along with English.

In the report of 1853–54 Reid wrote that: 'we look to Urdū and to Hindi (Symbolled out in Nāgri Character), as the sources where to obtain supplies of healthy mental food' (Edn. Reid 1854: 6). The distaste for Urdu had not quite ended because, as this report of the eight 'experimental districts' put it:

> As yet Urdu composition is in the hands of men who have been *taught* Persian only. A long time will elapse before purely Urdū schools are set on foot (Edn. Reid 1854: 6).

However, in the Tahsili schools, which were directly under the government, 'Hindi Scholars enter at once on the study of Urdū without going through a preliminary course of Persian reading' (Ibid., 6). In the indigenous schools, however, the British indulged local prejudices by allowing Persian to be taught. By this time (1853–54) the number of schools and students were as follows:

Table 2		
Language–wise Schools in 1854		
Language	**Schools**	**Scholars**
Persian	876	5,709
Persian-Urdu	155	1,789
Urdu	2	24
Urdu with other languages	244	3,532
Nagari	729	9,323
Kayasthi	385	2,497
Source: Edn. Reid 1854: 6.		

In short, because of British efforts, Urdu had begun to be
established as a language of formal schooling in the middle of
the nineteenth century in North India.

Urdu was also the vehicle of modernization. Modern subjects—
such as mathematics, accounting, history—were neglected in the
traditional Persian schools, but emphasized in the Urdu ones.
According to the Report of 1854:

> Arithmetic and Accounts are neglected in Persian Schools; while in
> Urdu Schools we find 795 boys reading the same, in polyglot 102, in
> Sanskrit 365, and in Hindi 4,172 (Edn. Reid 1854: 18).

Another indicator of modernity was the gender balance in
education. Though males preponderated, adult females getting
instruction were '2, 670 of whom 1,027 appear in the Shahjahanpur
returns'. The estimate according to the type of education was as
follows:

Table 3	
Type of Education for Females in (%)	
Quran	66
Hindi	25
Arabic	05
Persian	43
Urdu	14
Accounts	1
Source: Edn. Reid 1854: 45.	

URDU VERSUS HINDI

The British did not promote Urdu alone. They also promoted Hindi—which is to say Sanskritized Khari Boli—in education mostly because of the sheer number of the Hindus. Later on numbers began to translate into pressure when the Hindus (as well as Muslims) began to mobilize as an identity-conscious group. The education system provided them an opportunity to do so, especially because the education policy was contradictory and unjust. As King brings out:

> By sponsoring Hindi in Nagari at the elementary and secondary school levels, the government helped create the very differences between Hindi and Urdu that many British officers decried. The government created, or at least fed, the genie in the bottle and then found itself surprised when the genie tried to get out (King 1994: 186).

The contradiction was not only that many British officers condemned the Sanskritization of Khari Boli—like excessive Persianization of it—as being absurd because of its lack of intelligibility. It was also because bureaucratic jobs were mostly in Urdu. Thus, while the educational system seemed to give a

free choice between all the languages the criteria for employment favoured English at the highest level, Urdu (in most of present-day UP and the Punjab) at the lower one, while Hindi was allowed only in parts of the Hindi belt or in a smaller proportion of jobs—and that too mostly in the education department—in most of North India.

That is why, in the 1850s when the Hindi movement had not fully mobilized its supporters, those seeking government employment chose Urdu over Hindi. Even the lowest level of state employees found Urdu more useful then Hindi for employment. The report of 1853–54 tells us:

> Of the 156 Patwaris, who have received certificates, 46 have been examined in Hindi, 86 in Urdu, and 24 in both Hindi and Urdu (Edn. Reid 1854: 48).

The other government employees also required a certificate about which the *Report* says:

> Of the 1,559 individuals examined, with reference to their fitness to hold a certificate of form A, requiring the ability to read and write Hindi, or Urdu, and a knowledge of the elements of arithmetic, 782 have succeeded in gaining a *sanad-i-liyākat* while 777 have failed.... while in Urdu the unsuccessful are 142 in 397, and Urdu-Hindi examinees pass in proportion of 168 to 56 (Edn. Reid 1854: 49).

In short, while the British state promoted Urdu and Hindi both in the domain of education, its employment policies in much of North India tilted the balance in favour of Urdu—a fact which gave rise to much resentment among the Hindu nationalists, whose identity was being mobilized exactly on these very grievances during the nineteenth century.

THE RISE OF URDU

By the middle of the nineteenth century Urdu—but Persianized
and gentrified Urdu—was supplanting Persian as the language of
prestige and the identity symbol of the Muslim *ashrāf*. But as
competition with Persian decreased, that with English and Hindi
increased. English, being used in the highest domains of power
was beyond competition, so it was only Hindi which was left to
compete with. But initially the dice was loaded in favour of Urdu
not only because it was then the language of employment but
also because Persian—and by extension Arabic—were also the
languages of sophistication, urbanization and gentrification for
centuries. Thus, the residual prestige of the Islamic-heritage
languages was high even when Urdu itself was less in demand
and remained high till the beginning of the twentieth century.

Taking the data of schooling from the 1860s King has already
related the general patterns for learning Urdu or Hindi with the
rural-urban divide and area. In general the rural areas learned
Hindi while the urban ones preferred Urdu (1994: 98–99). In Oudh
and the western districts of the NWP (1st educational circle) the
Islamic heritage languages (mostly Persian but also Urdu and
some Arabic) were more in demand than the Hindu-heritage ones
(Sanskrit and Hindi) (53.9 per cent versus 44.4 per cent); in
Central NWP (2nd educational circle) the proportion is 19.1 to
78.1 per cent while in the Eastern districts (3rd educational
circle) it is 37.9 to 55.7 per cent (King 1994: Table 8, p. 99). The
fourth educational circle districts in the Saugar and Nerbudda
territories and Ajmer-Marwara which were all detached from UP
later are not included here.[1]

Taking the same data, we can relate language choice to
employment, vertical social mobility, modernization, and class.
During the nineteenth century, Urdu was very much in demand
in the urban, higher educational institutions of North India
frequented by the gentry. The first of these institutions were:

The Delhi College (1825); the Benares College (1792),
The Agra College (1823); the Bareilly College (1837),
The Ajmer School (1851).

In the Delhi College, we are told, that all 'the students read Urdu. The Arabic and Persian Scholars learnt enough of Hindee, to qualify them to hold the appointment of Regimental Moonshee' (Edn. NWP 1859a: 3). Indeed, this college was the pioneering institution for disseminating Western knowledge to Indians through the medium of Urdu. Its second principal, Aloys Sprenger (1813–1893), took advantage of the Delhi Vernacular Translation Society and the learned staff of the College to get several books translated into Urdu (Chaghtai 2006: 115). Moreover both 'the Oriental and the English departments of the Delhi College adopted Urdu as the medium of instruction for all scientific subjects' (Ibid., 115). The Benares College emphasized upon Sanskrit and Hindi but even there students studied Urdu in fairly large numbers. In the other colleges, Urdu was studied sometimes alone and sometimes in combination with English—as in Bareilly for many years—so that exact numbers studying Urdu are not easy to tabulate. However, looking at data from the NWP, Oudh and the Punjab, one can venture to state that Urdu was popular at the elite level (Annexure A–1/11 and A–2/11). At the lower levels, however, it was Hindi which was more in demand. For instance, in the Halkabandis Schools and the indigenous village schools, it was Hindi which most students studied (Annexures B–1/11; B–2/11; B–3/11). At the Tahsil level—in small towns—there was slightly more demand for Urdu (Annexure C/11). This increased even further at the middle level (Annexure D–1/11; D–2/11; D–3/11 and D–4/11) and was much higher at the high school level (Annexure E–1/11 and E–2/11). This was not only true for government schools but was also true for private schools of the higher classes of which data from NWP is given in Annexure-A–1/11. It was, therefore, a class phenomenon in

addition to being a rural/urban and geographical variable. The students at the lowest level, having little ambition or chance to rise much in terms of socio-economic class, did not aspire for markers of the higher classes and urban areas (i.e. Urdu and English). In towns and cities, where the higher schools were situated, there was always the possibility of transcending one's social class through employment which depended on one's knowledge of Urdu and English. That is why this equation did not change as much in favour of Hindi as the statistics on printing and publication in that language did till Urdu remained the language of employment in parts of North India.

This association of Urdu with urbanization, sophistication and elite status worked eventually against Urdu and the Muslim community. Not only did it provoke the Hindu nationalists to take umbrage at this assumption of superiority on the part of the partisans of Urdu, but also it made them (these partisans) assume superiority even when the cultural capital of Urdu was exhausted in the face of the rising power of Hindi.

The British officers who administered India were neither all against Urdu nor against Hindi. Their objective was to consolidate the empire in India but points of view, strategies and biases differed. One officer in 1854–55 recommended the abolition of Hindi. However, the Lt. Governor insisted upon a 'familiar acquaintance with the Hindee character' (Edn. NWP 1856: 21). In a report of 1872–73, the Director of Public Instruction, M. Kempson, agreed that Urdu and Persian supplies 'the ambitious pupil with the best hope of advancement in life' but went on to say that 'Hindi is the mother tongue of the district; and, if our operations are general in character, that is, if their object is the diffusion of knowledge, and the dissipation by its means of superstition and its connected evils, the proper vehicle of school teaching is Hindi' (Edn. NWP 1873: 21). The Secretary to the Government, however, responded by saying that 'the point to be considered is whether the people themselves desire it [Urdu] or

not' (C.A. Elliott's letter to Kempson, 14 November 1873. In Ibid., p. 7 of 'Orders of Government').

But the people's 'desire' was dependent mostly upon the cultural capital of Urdu—the fact that skills in its use could be exchanged for jobs, access to officials, upward social mobility and acceptance among middle-class, urban society. Thus the demand for Urdu kept rising as people aspired for social mobility. A report of 1877–78 says:

> The demand for Urdu teaching has greatly increased, and somewhat exceeds the supply. This difficulty will soon disappear, as all new teachers appointed are acquainted with Urdu (Edn. NWP and O 1878: 13).

Another indicator of Urdu's rising popularity was the number of people who attempted to qualify in the vernacular examination which was the entry requirement of government service. By 1888–89 'the number of candidates who used the Nagri character was less than one-third of those who wrote their answers in the Persian character' (Edn. NWP and O 1889: 22). Indeed, the number of examinees who took up Urdu and Persian rose every year since 1888 till, in 1891 it was reported that the 'vast majority of candidates appear in Urdu, that being the official form of the vernacular' (Edn. NWP and O 1891: 29). And this was even when, as the report indicates, 'the number of failures in Urdu is always greater than that in Nagri because Urdu is more difficult to Nagri students than Nagri is to Urdu ones' (Edn. NWP and O 1889: 66). For instance, the pass percentage in the two languages for the following years was:

Year	Pass percentage	
	Urdu	Hindi
1891–92	41	56
1892–93	47	59
1893–94	48	51
1894–95	41	47
Source: Education Reports of NWP and O of the above years.		

And such was the social acceptance of Urdu that even girls, who did not normally seek government service, preferred that language to Hindi.

	Urdu	Hindi
1891–92	488	380
1892–93	504	396
(Edn. NWP and O 1893: 57)		

If we remember that at the turn of the century 1898–99 Hindus were 75.43 and Muslims 21.52 per cent of the population of the NWP and Oudh, it is a testimony to the British policy of making Urdu the language of the lower domains of power that 78 per cent students took up Urdu as against only 22 per cent who took Hindi in the vernacular examination (Edn. NWP and O 1895: 46).

When the Hindi movement gained momentum after 1900 the number of Hindi publications, as we shall see in the chapter on print, increased and outstripped publications in Urdu. However, vernacular examinations remained more conservative because the language of employment remained Urdu. Overall, during the British period, there was so much official patronage for Urdu that, despite the large numbers of Hindi speakers and the efforts of the Hindi movement, it was Urdu which predominated. The

Educational Gazette, for instance, was written in Urdu and distributed to schools. The *Oudh Akhbār*, although a private Urdu publication, was also distributed free to schools (Edn. NWP and O 1884: 132). Thus, even up to 1924 when the Hindi movement had gained much ground, the figures for the choice of language in the advanced examinations for vernacular teachers remained as follows:

Year	Language chosen		
	Hindi	Urdu	Source
1919	92	133	Edn. UP 1919: 9
1920	139	156	Edn. UP 1920: 17
1921	123	132	Edn. UP 1921: 22
1923	104	235	Edn. UP 1923: 29
1924	130	294	Edn. UP 1924: 26

Urdu was not only used in education, administration and the courts of law—albeit at the lower level—but was also used for technical education. The Thomason Civil Engineering College at Roorke, for instance, announced that the prospective candidates for admission 'must have a good knowledge of the Oordoo language, and be able to read and write it in the Persian character with ease and accuracy' (Edn. NWP 1866: 63).

URDU IN OUDH

Oudh, ruled by an Iranian Shia dynasty, was a major centre of the Persianate Urdu culture in the nineteenth and the middle of the twentieth centuries. Here the number of students who opted for Urdu rather than Hindi was higher than most districts of the NWP. While figures for male students have been mentioned in the annexures on schools earlier, it may be noted that even female students preferred Urdu over Hindi for the region as a whole (Annexure-F/11). Students also chose to study Persian.

Indeed, Persian kept lingering on here longer than elsewhere so that a Deputy Commissioner wrote in 1869: 'They [Muslims] are not satisfied with Hindi and Urdu but want Persian and Arabic' (Edn O 1871a: 108). The following year's report noted that 'the Persian element in the ordinary language spoken in Oudh is very strong' (Edn O 1871b: 23). Indeed, being a part of *sharīf* culture in Lucknow, the Urdu language—and especially a formal, Persianized variety of it—carried so much cultural capital that the Hindus of Oudh, whether Kaesths or others, wanted to study Urdu and Persian (Ibid., 24).

For these reasons, even in the indigenous schools where normally peasant children learned Hindi in the Mahajani script, the children of Bara Banki opted for Persian (387 out of a total of 622) (Edn. O 1872: 3).

The report of 1872 gave the following comparative statement about the languages learned by boys in schools:

Year	English	Urdu	Persian	Hindi	Sanskrit	Arabic
1871–72	2,471	25,586	6,118	18,997	233	171
1872–73	2,488	28,353	6,527	22,353	455	209
Source: Edn. O 1873: 119.						

And the writer of the 1872 report concluded by saying: 'Urdu is thus by far the favourite study' (Ibid., 119). The report of 1876 repeated the same story.

Year	English	Urdu	Persian	Hindi	Sanskrit	Arabic
1874–75	4,826	33,388	8,517	26,428	834	220
1875–76	4,958	33,388	9,580	30,115	1,012	317
Source: Edn. O 1876: 4.						

URDU IN THE PUNJAB

Urdu was accepted as the vernacular language of the Punjab by the British rulers of India after consulting the officers posted in the districts of the new provinces which they had conquered in 1849 (Rahman 1996: 192–197). The Department of Public Instruction was established in January 1851 but its first report came to light in 1858. However, since Persian had been used by the Sikh rulers as an official language the education report of 1860–61 points out that 'the desire for learning Persian is so strong in most parts of the Punjab, that it seemed desirable to meet the wishes of the people in this matter...' (Edn. Pun 1864a: 8). That is perhaps why the Lieutenant Governor asked the DPI whether the courses of study borrowed from the North Western Provinces 'may not give an artificial prominence to Urdu, which does not naturally belong to it in these provinces' (Ibid., p. v).

Initially, as in other areas, the British encountered resistance to the teaching of Urdu. There were the ordinary Quran, Hindi as well as Gurmukhi schools. Persian was the desiderated subject of study both for Hindus and Muslims as it led to employment in the bureaucracy. Thus the *Administration Report* tells us:

> Both teachers and scholars especially objected to the study of Urdu. To educate a boy by teaching him his own language seemed to them to be almost a contradiction in terms. It was of course necessary to conciliate the people, and the plan adopted was to give the teachers two lists of books, one of Urdu books which *must* be read, and another of Persian books which *might* be read (Adm. Pun 1873: 151).

However, the British also kept political considerations in mind when implementing the policy so the following lines were added:

> At the same time Hindi schools were to be encouraged wherever the people desired them, in view of the danger of throwing education

entirely into the hands of the Muhammadans (Adm. Pun 1873: 151).

Gurmukhi schools were also allowed but remained less in number than Urdu ones. Indeed, perhaps because of the widespread use of Urdu in education, works of 'general interest' in the Punjabi language were more likely to be published in the Shahmukhi script (Adm. Pun 1904a: 106).

In the Punjab, as in the NWP, there were village and town schools. And, again as in the NWP, there were indigenous schools about which G.W. Leitner prepared a comprehensive report (Leitner 1882). The lower schools did teach the Quran by rote as well as Hindi (both in the Nagari and the Mahajani scripts), but Hindi did 'not lead to employment' and, as the DPI pointed out, 'no one cares to go beyond the elements of reading and writing' (Edn. Pun 1873: 24). Anyone who aspired for higher education—even for learning English, which was not taught 'below the middle' level, were supposed to 'be able to read and write Urdu and to work sums' (Edn Pun 1874: 51).

But Urdu did not remain unopposed in the Punjab. It was opposed by the claims of Punjabi which has been written about elsewhere (Rahman 1996: 191–209), English and Hindi. The opposition by people who wanted more English than Urdu to be taught, argued that English was preferable because it facilitated employment and had more prestige. The Anjuman-i-Punjab, the originator of the 'Oriental movement', declared that 'the Urdu language was quite unfit' for education at the higher level and, therefore, English should be the exclusive medium of instruction in high schools (Edn. Pun 1881: 8m).

Urdu was also opposed by the proponents of Hindi in the 1880s. W.M. Holroyd, the DPI, pointed out that unless the government changed its policy, Hindi and Sanskrit could not be used for teaching science, geography and mathematics nor could terms borrowed from these languages be employed. Instead, it

was Urdu which should also be taught in the villages. He reiterated the language policy in the Punjab forcefully again.

> The Urdu language was made the principal medium of instruction in Government schools in accordance with the strongly expressed opinion of Lord Lawrence, Sir Donald McLeod, and other experienced officers, and with full approval of the Court of Directors. The general principle on which this decision was founded was re-affirmed by the secretary of state (Edn. Pun 1882: 66).

It was in line with this policy that Punjabi in the Gurmukhi script was discouraged in the beginning. Thus 'permission to establish a Gurmukhi class was refused' (Edn. Pun 1884: 5).

However, by 1888–89 some candidates had presented themselves for Gurmukhi examinations in the Oriental college of Lahore. And even at the lower level many Gurmukhi schools were reported to be 'in receipt of grants' (Edn. Pun 1889: 86).

Traditionally, the indigenous village schools did not teach Urdu. They were reorganized in 1889 as Zamindari schools as they catered to rural society. Students could attend in the mornings or evenings and were let off to gather the harvest during the harvesting season. And it was in these schools that Urdu, as well as Hindi and Gurmukhi, were taught. The report of 1889–90 tells us:

> Urdu is the principal subject of instruction in 167 of the Indigenous schools examined for grants, Panjabi in the Gurmukhi character in 26, and Hindi in the Nagari character in 9. All the other private schools examined for grants were Urdu schools...' (Edn. Pun 1890: 133).

The Zamindari schools did not prove to be popular and it was felt that the Gurmukhi schools or classes started in 1889–90, would also be unpopular (Edn. Pun 1895:55). In 1897–98 there were 202 of these Zamindari schools out of which 191 were Urdu and the other Nagri ones (Edn. Pun 1898: 43).

Even in 1911–12 the Punjabi language, which was an optional vernacular in rural schools, had shown 'little sign as yet of replacing Urdu' though their number had risen from 32 to 102 and students from 917 to 4,067 (Adm. Pun 1913: 187).

Urdu was also used for medical studies. The Education Report of the Bengal Presidency (1839–40) mentions the idea of training 'Native Doctors' for both civil and military service who should 'be able to read and write the Hindoostanee language, in the Devanagari or Persian character' (Edn. B 1841: clvi). A similar course in Urdu was instituted in the Lahore Medical College in 1860, which changed its name to the Lahore Medical School later. It was a three-year course after which one could enter the medical profession as a 'Native Doctor'. The *Administration Reports* of the Punjab give a yearly report on the number of students in the 'Hindustani class' observing 'that the competition for entry into the Hindustani class continues' (Adm. Pun 1867: 66) which indicates that the successful candidates found jobs easily. By 1869, the school had passed out ninety-one doctors and was a well-established institution (Adm. Pun 1869: 124). The record available in these reports spans thirty-one years out of which the figures for the 'Urdu class' are not mentioned for the last, i.e. 1903–04. Even so, 3,786 studied medicine in Urdu, while 2,631 studied it in English, according to the reports from 1860–61 till 1903–04. The reports keep mentioning the native doctors till the end of the century when information about them disappears altogether.

URDU READING MATERIAL
AND MODERN CITIZENSHIP

Education was also part of the colonial project of creating useful citizens with the virtues of the Victorians: obedience, non-political and non-militant piety, bourgeois morality and industriousness. James Thomason, whom we have encountered earlier, wrote that, 'A popular and useful Oordoo literature is

now forming...and it is becoming the vehicle for conveying practical and useful knowledge to all classes of the people' and this, he felt, would make the new moral citizen he so desired (Thomason 1847). The Muslim reformers fully agreed with these ideals and they produced literature in Urdu which promoted it. This reformist literature for educational purposes has been described by Moinuddin Aqil (2008: 403–418). Similarly the literature on Hindi has been described in even more detail and with great scholarly thoroughness by Francesca Orsini, who looks at textbooks (Orsini 2002: 92–111), informal reading material created by public institutions such as the Arya Samaj (Ibid., 111–116); the role of the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan in examining candidates (Ibid., 116–124); literature, journals, magazines, etc.

Here we will confine ourselves to only some of the most influential texts in Urdu for their overall influence on the production of the modern, colonial subject on the lines described by Gauri Viswanathan, in her excellent study of the way English literature created the colonial subject in India (Viswanathan 1989).The idea of the moral influence of texts is a perennial theme in colonial education. For instance, among others, Dr Ballantyne taught Shakespeare to his students in the Benares College in order 'to give the mind of a Hindoo reader some tincture of the higher tone of morality, which belongs to the European civilization' (Edn. NWP 1848: 24). This was part of the project of shaping the modern consciousness among Indians. And it was carried out by teaching modern Western knowledge through English and the vernaculars.

One way of doing this was through translation of the Western canonical texts into Urdu. The Society for the promotion of knowledge of India through the Medium of Vernacular Languages, also called the Delhi Vernacular Translation Society, translated books from 1830 till 1857. Later Sir Syed founded his Scientific Society in Ghazipur and the work was carried on by

the Darul Tarjuma at Osmania University and still goes on in
Pakistan through the National Language Authority, Urdu Science
Board (Lahore), Majlis-e-Zuban-e-Daftari (Lahore), Idara-e-
Tasnif-o-Talif-o-Tarjuma (Karachi) and in India, mainly through
the Anjuman-e-Taraqqi-e-Urdu and some universities (Chaghtai
2006: 116–117). The translations, were representations and, says
Margrit Pernau, 'it becomes clear that the colonial power aimed
at controlling both ways: the representation of the Indian
tradition for a British Public (and by implication for the Indians
themselves), but also the images Indians received about the
West...' (Pernau 2006: 19).

The modern Indian Muslim had to be acquainted with subjects
introduced by the modernizing British. Munshi Mohammad
Zakaullah (1832–1910), for instance, was one of those who tried
to bring modern scientific knowledge through the medium of
Urdu to Indians. He is said to have started writing at the age of
19 and published 147 books ranging from subjects as diverse as
mathematics to history. He also translated scientific books
from English to Urdu. In a sense, then, he was a living Urdu
encyclopaedia of nineteenth century Delhi (Hasan 2006: 290–
297).

Zakaullah taught in the Delhi College (or Dilli Kalij as it was
called in Urdu) where scientific and mathematical subjects were
taught in Urdu. Besides Munshi Zakaullah, the college had others
on the faculty who translated much Western learning in Urdu.
According to Mushirul Hasan, 'it produced a substantial number
of enlightened writers who, in turn, contributed to the develop-
ment of Urdu prose as a vehicle for transmitting knowledge, and
encouraged a simple style of writing as against the high-flown,
bombastic, and ornate style' (Hasan 2006: 121). In 1847 there was
an outburst of Urdu translations—128 from Arabic, Persian and
English books—of both the classical and the modern type (Malik
1980: 55).

Above all, essentially modern attitudes were introduced by creating a new vernacular literature in both Urdu and Hindi. We have mentioned how the urge for reform of the printed word came, inter alia, out of the Victorian squeamishness about the frank and uninhibited allusion to sex in medieval Persian classics, used in the curricula which the British shared with Indian modernist reformers (see Rahman 2002: 490–509 for this movement). Thus the medieval texts were discarded and new ones in Urdu as well as Hindi were substituted in their place. These texts endorsed new, modern, values instead of the older, medieval ones. At the ontological level, the world was seen as an ordered, rule-governed, causally functioning cosmos. The medieval world, on the other hand, was magical. That is, it had no order as rules were superseded by miracles and cause and effect were held in abeyance by enchantment. The epistemological corollary of the medieval world-view was that one endured the world as a mystery without, however, intervening in it (unless one was a magician). However, modern ways of understanding reality meant that one could understand and, hence, control the world. Thus, while the medieval texts were theological, linguistic or literary; the modern ones were scientific and analytical. At the normative level, while the medieval texts did endorse universal humanitarian values at the highest level, they did so through anecdotes, including sexual ones, which most people now found embarrassing. Moreover, they were frankly mis-trustful of women and advocated control over them. The modern texts, on the other hand, endorsed middle class virtues: order, good management, frugality, sobriety, hard work, and sexual modesty—just the very things Muslim reformers wanted to reform in their decadent society. The new texts also taught respect and admiration for the British government, regard for the rule of law and other modern, civic virtues. Hence, modernity was very much a part of being a colonial subject of the British Empire in India. Urdu, along with Hindi and English, were

important vehicles of this attempt at creating the modern, colonial Indian subject of the empire.

Contrary to medieval assumptions, modernity included women into the project of citizenship. Thus the education of girls became a much debated issue among Muslim reformers and educationists. Girls were mostly taught in home-based schools by female teachers (*ustānīs*). Some of the *ustānīs* visited the homes of their affluent pupils and received payment. Others, like Asghari in Deputy Nazir Ahmed's (1833–1912) *Bināt–un-Nāsh* (The daughters of the Bier) (n.d.), kept school in their house where girls learned the Urdu script, read books on religion and morality through Urdu stories (mostly in verse) and learned to sew and cook. The books mentioned by Nazir Ahmed are as follows: A translation of the Quran, *Kanz-ul-Maslā, Qiāmat Nāmā, Rāh-ē-Nijāt, Wafāt Nāmā, Qissā Shāh-ē-Rōme, Qissā Sipāhī Zādā, Mu'ajzā Shāh Yemen, Risālā Maulūd Sharīf, Shahīd Mashāriq ul Anwar.* These are all religious books, some being based on the folk Islam of the period, which was intermixed with popular belief in miracles and mysticism. The modern subjects were also taught through the medium of Urdu. These included the history of India, *Chand Pand* (Moral Aphorisms), *Munta<u>kh</u>ab-ul-Hikāyāt* (Moral Stories) and *Mirāt ul Urūs* (1869) (The Mirror the Bride)—Nazir Ahmed's own contribution to scholarship for women (Ahmed 2004: 789–949).

It is notable that by the late nineteenth century, literacy in Urdu was seen as necessary, not only for men but also for women. Thus a 'Minute' by R. Montgomery, Lt. Governor of the Punjab, of 3 May 1864 describing schools in the Punjab for girls in 1864, says that the curriculum included basic reading and writing in Urdu and Punjabi, arithmetic and needlework (Quoted from Minault 1998: 164). Badruddin Tyabji also testified before the Hunter Commission that:

There are some Karis or Mullas in the chief centres of the Muhammadan Population who teach the Koran and perhaps a little

Hindustani and Persian to the girls (Quoted from Minault 1998:
184).

Tyabji's own wife, Bibi Rahat, could read Gujarati and Urdu, and
he himself translated English novels into Urdu for her edification
(Minault 1998: 186). Bibi Rahat was a Gujarati but she and other
Muslims, even when their mother-tongue was different, had
started learning Urdu. In Bengal too, where Bengali was the
mother-tongue, Rokeya Sakhavat Husain's Sakhavat Memorial
Girls' School in Calcutta taught 'Arabic, Persian, Urdu, Bengali,
and English' (Minault 1998: 259).

While sending girls to schools was not favoured among the
ashrāf, girls were often educated at home. Ashrafunnissa Begum
(1840–1903), or Bibi Ashraf as she was called, learned Urdu by
reading the Urdu *marsiyās*, and then came to write letters for the
family in Urdu (Naim 1987). Syed Mumtaz Ali's (1860–1935)
weekly newspaper *Tahzīb un-Niswã*, edited by his wife Muhammadi
Begam, came to be published from Lahore in 1898 and its avowed
aim was to reform women through informal education in Urdu
(Minault 1998: 73–95). Among the ideas disseminated by this
publication was that extreme segregation of women (*purdāh*) was
harmful and that the veil was enough protection for them if they
went out (Minault 1998: 87).

Besides the magazines, informal education was also spread to
women—along with men—through didactic books masquerading
as fiction or religious books like Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi's
Bahishtī Zēvar. In 1863, Maulvi Karim Uddin, educated in the Delhi
College from 1840 to 1844, published <u>Khat-ē-Taqdīr</u> (The Line of
Fate) which is a didactic story about a young man who abandons
the path of poetry and ostentation to follow a puritanical lifestyle
dedicated to learning (Powell 2006: 222–225). It was a precursor
of other such works—especially those of Nazir Ahmed—which
followed. And, again like these more famous successors, Karim
Uddin's books were also used in the schools of the Punjab (Ibid.,

223). At about the same time Maulvi Wazir Ali, a religious reformer, wrote a book entitled *Mirāt-un-Nisā* (The Mirror of Women). But nobody got the success which fell to the lot of Nazir Ahmed's works. In *Taubat un Nusūh* (The Repentance of Nusuh) (1874), probably based on Daniel Defoe's (1660–1731), *The Family Instructor*, the protagonist, Nusuh, condemns the sloth and hedonism of the Indian way of life and destroys the 'obscene' literature associated with that lifestyle (Pritchett 1994:186). In *Mirāt ul Urūs* (1869), Asghari represents the modern, reformed woman who runs her household with intelligence, foresight and ability. Her elder sister, Akbari, on the other hand, represents old-fashioned wasteful extravagance. In *Fasanā-i-Muttilā* (The Tale of the Afflicted One) (1885), as mentioned in an earlier chapter, the protagonist, Muttila, is ruined by the amorousness of Persian literature. These themes, critical as they were of pre-modern values and attitudes, were popular both with the British, as well as the Indian reformers. Thus Nazir Ahmed's works, especially *Mirāt ul Urūs*, were published repeatedly and in large numbers as Urdu came to be established as the main language of literacy in much of North India.

Nazir Ahmed's books, though full of Islamic references including Arabic verses, were praised by the British (Naim 1984). *Mirāt ul Urūs* was considered very useful for women. In a report on reading of the 1st Circle of Education, it is stated that 'all the girls of the upper classes read from the *Mirat-ul-Arus* well and intelligently' (Edn. NWP 1873: 83). M. Kempson, the Director of Public Instruction, recommended it to the Government of the NWP. The Secretary of the Government replied that 'the Lieutenant Governor has perused the *Mirat-ul-Urūs*, or 'The Bride's Mirror', with the highest satisfaction' (in Hasan 2005: 263–264). The Secretary observed that the 'work possesses merit hitherto (so far as His Honor is aware) unknown in Oordoo literature' (Ibid., 264). The author was rewarded Rs 1000—a princely sum at that time—and 2,000 copies of the book were

obtained for the Government (Edn. NWP 1874: 8–9). It was also recommended to the Board of Examiners as a suitable textbook for examinations. *Taubat un Nusūh* was also given an award of Rs 1,000 (Edn. NWP 1874: 8–9). Nazir Ahmed's *Bināt un Nāsh*, an extension of *Mirāt ul Urūs*, concerns the education of girls in a home-based school run by a female teacher. The girls are taught home management, good manners and basic scientific facts in Urdu. By 1874, 125 out of 1,164 works won the prizes sponsored by the NWP Government and four-fifths of them, including Nazir Ahmed's novels, were in Urdu (Edn. NWP 1874: 8–9). Yet, although, according to Christina Oesterheld, 'nineteenth-century's Urdu was at its best in his writings' he apparently valued 'English and Arabic' more on pragmatic and religious and cultural grounds, taking Urdu 'for granted' as the most congenial languages for disseminating his ideas in North India (Oesterheld 2006: 316). However, Nazir Ahmed's works actually went beyond the Urdu-using readers of North India. By 1885, Nazir Ahmed's novels had been translated into Bangla, Braj, Kashmiri, Punjabi, and Gujarati. The total circulation was 40,000 copies. Within twenty years of its publications *Mirāt ul Urūs* appeared in editions totalling 100,000 copies (Quoted from Hasan 2005: 160).

There were many imitators of Nazir Ahmad such as Sayyid Ahmad Dehlavi (1846–1918), Bashiruddin Ahmed (1868–1927) and Rashidul Khairi. The latter two were related to him being his son and nephew, respectively. Syed Ahmad Dehlavi wrote the *Insha-i-Hādī un-Nisā*, which is a manual to teach women how to write letters in Urdu. He also wrote two didactic novels *Rāhat Zamānī kī Mazēdār kahānī* (The Enjoyable Story of Rahat Zamani) and *Qissā-ē-Mehr Afrōz* (The Story of Mehr Afroz). The first is against wasting time and the second about womens' lives in an upper-class Muslim family. Rashidul Khairi's six novels—*Subāh-ē-Zindagī, Sham-ē-Zindagī, Shab-i-Zindagī, Noha-ē-Zindagī, Fasānā-ē-Zindagī* and *Nālā Zār*—are obviously and crudely didactic. They are not only full of sermonizing, but even have ingredients of medicines,

recipes for delicacies and patterns for embroidery. The aim is to train a girl to be a paragon of virtue like the main character Naseema (Khairi 1936).

Bachiruddin's novel, *Iqbal Dulhan*—like Khairi's *Nohā-ē-Zindigī*—is about the problem of marrying a second wife, despite an excellent relationship with the first one, in order to have children. This is a theme also touched upon in *Shab-ē-Zindagī*, and the message is that the first wife must not be lazy, wasteful, extravagant or improvident because such defects in her are legitimate grounds for a second marriage (Khairi 1936: 242–245). Perhaps the most notable imitator of Nazir Ahmed was Rasheed un Nisa (1855–1926), a lady from a respectable Muslim family of Bihar, whose novel *Islāh un Nisā*, written in 1881, is a pioneering work as the author is the first woman novelist whose purpose was to reform and educate women. She was probably only sixteen years of age when she read *Mirāt ul Urūs* (Nisa 1894: 222) and she explicitly mentions it as a text which reformed many uneducated, spendthrift, disorganized, and superstitions women. Nazar Sajjad Haider's novel, *Akhtar un Nissā Bēgum*, serialized in the journal *Taēhzīb-ē-Niswã* before being published in 1911 as a novel, is also against second marriage and supportive of women's education (Haider 2004). There are many other works of this nature—such as Shah Jahan Begam's *Tahzīb un-Niswã wa Tarbiyat al-Īmān*— (The refinement of women and the training for creating faith) which women could read in school or home.

In the Punjab, too, textbooks in Urdu were prepared and distributed by the 'Urdu sub-committee' of the Education Department (Edn. Pun 1892: 100). For instance, the report of 1892–93 tells us that, 'the Sughar Bivi, or Good House Mother, is taught in the Middle schools, and seems to be a subject in which the girls take much interest' (Edn. Pun 1893: 72). Books for women were encouraged, and the Urdu sub-committee gave annual reports of these additions.

The project of educating women in Urdu was informed with the language ideology of the time. This privileged the standardized, male sociolect over the regional varieties, rural sub-varieties, and women's language (WL). Nazir Ahmed's ideal Asghari spoke standard Urdu rather than the *Bēgmātī Zubān* (the ladies' language). And Hali has a section on WL in his *Majālis un-Nisā* (the assemblies of women) in which a boy is advised not to use WL (Minault 1998: 43).

Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi of the *Bihishtī Zēvar* fame also makes WL appear sinful (Minault 1998: 69). He narrates with great disapproval how, upon entering an assembly, women either raise their hand to the forehead in salutation or just say '*salām*' (peace). Others respond in the same manner or with traditional blessings: 'may you stay cool' (*thandī rahō*); 'may you live long' (*jītī rahō*); may you live in marital bliss' (*suhāgan rahō*) etc. He condemns these indigenous forms of salutation in favour of the strictly Islamic '*As salām-ō-alaikum* (peace be upon you) and '*wālaikum as-salām*' (peace be upon you too) in response (Thanvi n.d., Part 6: 18). He also gives a list of words which women pronounce incorrectly and recommends their correct pronunciation in standard Urdu (Thanvi n.d., Part 10: 51–52).

Thus, as women learned the formal register of Urdu, they distanced themselves from their Hindu counterparts, country cousins, and the kind of women one encounters in the *Rēkhtī*. In a sense, then, the formal *Bēgmātī Zubān* was a product of assumptions and values which marked the boundaries of a modern, Muslimized, female 'self' which excluded more than it included. Thus the process of alienation from Hindus, which was part of the *sharīf* Muslim male consciousness in much of North India, also affected Muslim women.

But, despite the efforts of the social reformers, whose works have been given attention earlier, and the puritanical ulema who had an even more stringent ideal for a Muslim woman in mind, the ability to read did introduce women to non-religious ideas.

After all, Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi's two lists of 'useful' and 'harmful' books in his *Bahishtī Zēvar* includes twenty-six books which he condemns, and these are not only novels—the only one he approves of is *Taubat un Nusūh*—but also newspapers and, of course, all poetry and drama. There are also religious works which he disapproves of because they belong to the tradition of folk Islam or contain weak traditions.[2] But, the press was churning out so much literature that it was always possible for women to read these works. Hence, for people like Thanvi, as Barbara Metcalf remarks, 'Urdu, as a source of knowledge, was clearly to his mind a mixed blessing' (Metcalf 1991: 96). Thus, the oppositional trends of Puritanism and religiosity went hand in hand with romanticism and the desire for more liberal values. The personality produced by these contrary streams of ideas was divided, even schizoid in a cultural sense, and often confused. These trends now express themselves in the polarization found in the Muslims of Pakistan and India; in Talibanization on the one hand and the 'burger' or 'yuppie' culture on the other.

In short, both the present-day UP and Punjab were flooded with Urdu books through the education system. Even in the army, a powerful educational institution in its own right, there were instructional manuals in Roman Urdu as well as the Perso-Arabic script. For instance, the following pamphlets, all about military training, were written in Urdu: *Qawāid-ē-Chānd Mārī* (500 copies) (rules of target practice); target practice; *Musketry Regulations in Urdū* (500 copies) and *Rifle Exercises in* Urdu (500 copies) (Edn. Pun 1876: 76).

Overall, then, the British spread Urdu in the areas now comprising the areas of UP and the Punjab through a number of institutions among which the domain of education played a very important role. But education in the modern world needed a lot of printed material and it is to this that we turn now.

NOTES

1. The educational circles of the North Western Provinces comprised the following districts:

   1st educational circle: Aligarh, Bulandshaher, Merut, Muzaffarnagar, Saharanpur, Badaun, Muradabad, Shahjahanpur.

   2nd educational circle: Agra, Kanpur, Etah, Etawah, Farrukhabad, Hamirpur, Jhansi, Muthra, Mynpuri.

   3rd educational circle: Allahabad, Azimgarh, Barda, Benares, Fatehpur, Ghazipur, Jaunpur, Mirzapur.

   4th educational circle: Baitul, Chanderi, Dumoh, Hoshungabad, Jabbalpur, Mundlah, Nursingpur, Seonee, Saugor.

   Kumaun, Garhwal and Ajmer have been excluded in the figures presented in this chapter. Districts in the 4th circle were excluded from the NWP later.

2. The list of 'harmful books' is as follows:

   All collections of poetic works and books of ghazals; *Indar Sabhā, Qissā badr-ē-Munīr; Qissā Shāh Yemen; Dāstān Amīr Hamzā; Gul Bakaolī; Alf Lailā; Naqsh Sulaimānī; Fālnāmā, Qissā Māh Ramzān; Mu'ajzā Āl-ē-Nabī, Chahl Risālā; Vafāt Nāmā Ārāesh-ē-Mehfil; Jang Nāmā Hazrat 'Alī; Jang Nāmā Mohammad Hanif; Tafsīr Surāh Yusuf; Hazār Mas'alā; Hairat ul Fiqā; Guldastā Mē'rāj' Nā't hī Nā't; Dīvān-ē-Lutf; Mirāt ul 'Urus; Bināt un Nā'sh; Mohsināt Ayāmī;* all novels and newspapers (Thanvi n.d., part–10: 60–61).

   [The Assembly of Indar; The Story of Badr-e-Munir; The Story of the King of Yemen; The Tale of Amir Hamza; The Fragrant Flower (a female name); One Thousand and One Nights; The Mark of Solomon; Writing on Foretelling the Future; The Story of the Month of Ramazan; The Account of the War of the Revered Ali; The Account of the War of Mohammad Hanif; The Exegesis of the Verse of Joseph; The One Thousand Religious Solutions to Issues; The Perplexity; The Bouquet of the Ascension [of the Prophet of Islam]; Poems and more Poems in Praise of the Prophet of Islam; The Poetic Collection of Lutf; The Mirror of the Bride; Daughters of the Bier; The Conferrers of Daily Favours].

Annexure-A–1/11

NB: The sources for these annexures are the education reports of the relevant years of the areas given in the headings.

NORTH WESTERN PROVINCES
PRIVATE SCHOOLS OF THE HIGHER CLASSES OPEN TO GOVT. INSPECTION

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Total	% Urdu	% Hindi	Ratio of Urdu to Hindi
863–64 (34 schools)	1392	1228	2620	53.13	46.9	1:0.88
1865–66	6626	4718	11344	58.41	41.6	1:071
1866–67	8515	6558	15073	56.49	43.5	1:0.77
1869–70 (8 schools)	968	723	1691	57.24	42.8	1:0.75
1870–71(10 schools)	1240	1250	2490	49.80	50.2	1:1.01
1871–72 (12 schools)	1415	938	2353	60.14	39.9	1:0.66
Totals:	20156	15415	35571	56.66	43.3	

Annexure-A–2/11

OUDH
PRIVATE ELITIST SCHOOLS

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Total	% Urdu	% Hindi	Ratio of Urdu to Hindi
1873–74 (total 05)	1110	352	1462	75.92	24.1	1:0.32
1874–75 (total 05)	1110	352	1462	75.92	24.1	1:032
1875–76 (total 05)	946	265	1211	78.12	21.88	1:0.28
Totals:	3166	969	4135	76.57	23.4	

NORTH WESTERN PROVINCES
Halkabandi Schools

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Total	% (Urdu)	% (Hindi)	Ratio of Urdu to Hindi
1856–57 1857–58	1163	15456	16619	7.00	93.0	1:13.29
1858–59	4878	38001	50626	24.94	75.1	1:7.79
1859–60	12625	51693	62905	17.82	82.2	1:4.09
1860–61	11212	62014	77117	19.58	80.4	1:5.53
1861–62	15103	71628	90963	21.26	78.7	1:4.74
1862–63	19335	72725	92411	21.30	78.7	1:3.76
1863–64	19686	69567	89061	21.89	78.1	1:3.53
1864–65	19494	70582	87819	19.63	80.4	1:3.62
1865–66	17237	73936	95795	22.82	77.2	1:4.29
1866–67	21859	80968	109078	25.77	74.2	1:3.70
1869–70	28110	76427	104537	26.89	73.1	1:2.72
1870–71	29199	80951	110150	26.51	73.5	1:2.77
Totals:	**199901**	**763948**	**963849**	**20.74**	**79.3**	

OUDH
Govt. Village Schools (Primary)

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Total	% (Urdu)	% (Hindi)	Ratio of Urdu to Hindi
1868–69	8767	9102	17869	49.06	50.9	1:1.04
1869–70	10519	10923	21442	49.06	50.9	1:1.04
1870–71	9779	13247	23026	42.47	57.5	1:1.35
1871–72	16459	15049	31508	52.24	47.8	1:0.91
1872–73	17346	17428	34774	49.88	50.1	1:1.00
1873–74	18708	18284	36992	50.57	49.4	1:0.98
1874–75	19678	20823	40501	48.59	51.4	1:1.06
1875–76	20482	24361	44843	45.67	54.3	1:1.19
Totals:	**121738**	**129217**	**250955**	**48.51**	**51.5**	

Annexure-B–3/11

PUNJAB
Govt. Village Schools/Govt. Lower Schools

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Total	% (Urdu)	% (Hindi)	Ratio of Urdu to Hindi
1860–61 (V)	27442	258	27700	99.07	0.9	1:0.01
1861–62 (V)	33414	5874	39288	85.05	15.0	1:0.18
1872–73 (L)	44659	4103 (N) 1522 (M	50284	88.81	11.2	1:0.13
1873–74 (L)	48350	5231	53581	90.24	9.8	1:0.11
1874–75 (L)	59427	3633 (N) 1847 (M)	64907	91.56	8.4	1:0.09
1877–78 (L)	57168	2860	60028	95.24	9.1	1:0.05
1878–79 (L)	51113	3406	54519	93.75	10.1	1:0.07
1879–80 (P)	77833	8201	86034	90.47	6.4	1:0.11
1881–82 (P)	86072	9039	95111	90.50	5.8	1:0.11
1882–83 (P)	90043	9850	99893	90.14	5.5	1:0.11
1883–84 (P)	97446	10684	108130	90.12	5.1	1:0.11
Totals:	**672967**	**55403**	**739475**	**91.01**	**7.5**	

Annexure-C/11

NORTH WESTERN PROVINCES
Tahsili Schools

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Total	% (Urdu)	% (Hindi)	Ratio of Urdu to Hindi
1856–57	2593	5152	7745	33.48	66.5	1:1.9
1857–58						
1858–59	4766	7951	12717	37.48	62.5	1:1.67
1859–60	8596	13296	21892	39.27	60.7	1:1.55
1860–61	5835	12176	18011	32.40	67.6	1:2.09
1861–62	5263	9167	14430	36.47	63.5	1:174
1862–63	5542	9153	14695	37.71	62.3	1:165
1863–64	5895	9036	14931	39.48	60.5	1:1.53
1864–65	7105	9987	17092	41.57	58.4	1:1.41
1865–66	7803	10901	18704	41.72	58.3	1:1.40
1866–67	8008	11995	20003	40.03	60.0	1:1.50
1869–70	5547	11881	17428	31.83	68.2	1:2.14
1870–71	3790	9678	13468	28.14	71.9	1:2.55
1871–72	4015	8360	12375	32.44	67.6	1:2.08
Totals:	74758	128733	203491	36.74	63.3	

Annexure-D–1/11

NORTH WESTERN PROVINCES
Govt. Middle Schools (which teach in English)

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Total	% Urdu	% Hindi	Ratio of Urdu to Hindi
1863–64	1013	377	1390	72.88	27.1	1:0.4
1864–65	1496	832	2328	64.26	35.7	1:0.6
1866–67	348	0	348	100.00	0.0	1:0.0
1869–70	767	231	998	76.85	23.1	1:0.3
1870–71	716	190	906	79.03	21.0	1:0.3
1871–72	748	170	918	81.48	18.5	1:0.2
Totals:	5088	1800	6888	73.87	26.1	

OUDH
Govt. Middle Schools

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Total	% (Urdu)	% (Hindi)	Ratio of Urdu to Hindi
1868–69 (48 schools)	4961	2973	7934	62.53	37.5	1:0.60
1869–70	1611	686	2297	70.13	29.9	1:0.43
1870–71	4495	2049	6544	68.69	31.3	1:0.46
1871–72	5684	2074	7758	73.27	26.7	1:0.36
1872–73	7132	3129	10261	69.51	30.5	1:0.44
1873–74	7096	3029	10125	70.08	29.9	1:0.43
1874–75 (20 schools)	1998	268	2266	88.17	11.8	1:0.13
1875–75 (Venoe Town schools)	3193	1778	4971	64.23	35.8	1:0.56
1875–76 (Anglo Vernoe)	1780	330	2110	84.36	15.6	1:0.19
1875–76 (Verroc)	3424	1853	5277	64.89	35.1	1:0.54
Totals:	**41374**	**18169**	**59543**	**69.49**	**30.5**	

OUDH
Govt. Middle School (Superior Zillah Schools)

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Total	% (Urdu)	% (Hindi)	Ratio of Urdu to Hindi
1868–69	554	183	737	75.17	24.8	1:0.33
1869–70	643	247	890	72.25	27.8	1:0.38
1870–71 (48 schools)	1749	755	2504	69.85	30.2	1:0.43
1871–72 (8 schools and 22 branches)	2130	828	2958	72.01	28.0	1:0.39
1872–73	2313	779	3092	74.81	25.2	1:0.34
1873–74	2331	709	3040	76.68	23.3	1:0.30
1874–75	1495	202	1697	88.10	11.9	1:0.14
1875–76	1517	176	1693	89.60	10.4	1:0.12
Totals:	**12732**	**3879**	**16611**	**76.65**	**23.4**	

PUNJAB
Middle Schools

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Total	% (Urdu)	% (Hindi)	Ratio of Urdu to Hindi
1872–73	10233	958	11191	91.44	8.6	1:0.09
1873–74	12269	2235	14504	84.59	15.4	1:0.18
1874–75	10347	2150	12497	82.80	17.2	1:0.21
1877–78	21893	2480	24373	89.82	10.2	1:0.11
1878–79	20428	2183	22611	90.35	9.7	1:0.11
1879–80	5263	23	5286	99.56	0.4	1:0.00
1880–81	5979	69	6048	98.86	1.1	1:0.01
1881–82	5668	28	5696	99.51	0.5	1:0.00
1882–83	6540	48	6588	99.27	0.7	1:0.01
1883–84	7221	5	7226	99.93	0.1	1:0.00
Totals:	**105841**	**10179**	**116020**	**91.23**	**8.8**	

NORTH WESTERN PROVINCES

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Total	% Urdu	% Hindi	Ratio of Urdu to Hindi
1866–67	261	215	476	54.83	45.2	1:0.82
1869–70	943	438	1381	68.28	31.7	1:0.46
1870–71	900	462	1362	66.08	33.9	1:0.51
1871–72	881	472	1353	65.11	34.9	1:0.54
Total	**2985**	**1587**	**4572**	**65.29**	**34.7**	

PUNJAB
GOVT. HIGH SCHOOLS (SUPERIOR)

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Total	% (Urdu)	% (Hindi)	Ratio of Urdu to Hindi
1860–61	1847	258	2105	87.74	12.3	1:0.14
1861–62	2028	5874	7902	25.66	74.3	1:2.90
1872–73 (06 schools)	4	0	4	100.00	0.0	1:0.00
1873–74	12	0	12	100.00	0.0	1:0.00
1874–75 (08 schools)	71	0	71	100.00	0.0	1:0.00
1877–78	70	0	70	100.00	0.0	1:0.00
1878–79	46	0	46	100.00	0.0	1:0.00
Totals:	**4078**	**6132**	**10210**	**39.94**	**60.1**	

OUDH
GOVT. FEMALE SCHOOLS

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Total	% (Urdu)	% (Hindi)	Ratio of Urdu to Hindi
1868–69	395	258	653	60.49	39.5	1:0.65
1869–70	1163	5874	7037	16.53	83.5	1:5.05
1870–71	792	587	1379	57.43	42.6	1:0.74
1871–72	1119	815	1934	57.86	42.1	1:0.73
1872–73	1237	802	2039	60.67	39.3	1:5.65
1873–74	1222	847	2069	59.06	40.9	1:0.69
1874–75	1301	658	1959	66.41	33.6	1:0.51
1875–76	1056	843	1899	55.61	44.4	1:0.80
Totals:	**8285**	**10684**	**18969**	**43.68**	**56.3**	

12

Urdu in Print

Print hastened the process of the shift from orality to literacy, which writing had begun for a very small section of the educated elite in South Asia, ever since the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi was written. Orality involves the use of set phrases, mnemonic devices, pre-logical ways of thinking, memorization rather than analytical precision, lack of definiteness or closure, phonocentric rather than logocentric modes of perception, and lack of self-consciousness or interiorization of consciousness (Mc Luhan 1962; Ong 1982; Eisenstein 1979). Literacy, therefore, values the unconventional, creative use of language and encourages abstract thought and the possibility of constantly examining, or interiorizing, abstract ideas of the self.

The printing press came to India as part of the modernity, which the colonial state brought to that country. But it is only now that scholars have started giving attention to the role of the printed word in British colonialism. Miles Ogborn's recent book, *Indian Ink* (2007), has filled a gap by investigating the East India Company's documents in order to understand the 'metropolitan politics of print' (Ogborn 2007: chapters 4 and 5) and the role of the printed word in India (Ibid., Chapter 6). The gist of this scholarly enterprise is to understand how writing (not just print) was 'a vital part of the reconfiguring of the relationships between Europe and Asia through trade and empire' (Ogborn 2007: 26). The aim of this chapter is less ambitious: to investigate how Urdu came to be printed in British India and what consequences this had in the domains of education, the construction of identity and

the venture of creating the new citizen of the British Indian Empire.

The printing press had been introduced in India even in Mughal times but had never been made use of. During British rule it did come into mass use. However, the attitude of the British officers towards the printing press changed with time. Nor, indeed, did all of them have the same attitude towards it at any time. During Lord Minto's time as Governor General (1807–1813), it is reported that 'visions of the printing press and the Bible were ever making their [the British] flesh to creep, and their hair to stand erect with horror' (Kaye 1854, Vol. 1: 248). The footnote of this page narrates the story of Captain Sydenham, the Resident at the Court of the Nizam of Hyderabad, who procured an air pump, a printing press and the model of a man-of-war for the Nizam. He mentioned this in his letter to the Chief Secretary and 'was censured for having placed in the hands of a native Prince so dangerous an instrument as a printing press' (Ibid., 248 footnote). As it happened, the Nizam showed no interest in the press and the Resident explained that he could enter the 'Tosha-Khana (or Treasure-house), and there so cripple the press as to ensure its never being in a fit state to do duty again!' (Ibid., 248 footnote). However, printing did enter India and the rise of the printed word in Urdu, as well as in Hindi, is coterminous with the rise of the modern, colonial state in the subcontinent.

For various reasons printing entered South Asia rather late. One reason for this delay in the introduction of printing could be, as C.A. Bayly points out, that information was communicated quite efficiently and speedily, both in writing and orally in pre-print India, so that 'printing in this sense was not needed until society began to change more radically under colonial rule' (Bayly 1996: 200). The most insightful analysis, however, is of Francis Robinson who contends that orality—specifically the recitation of the Quran—is at the centre of learning in Islam and,

hence, print was a threat to this centrality of orally transmitted knowledge (Robinson 1996: 64–69).

The printed word owes its existence to the expression of meaning (both in phonographic and logographic systems) by marks on spaces (or in electronically constructed screens). These marks themselves are indexed to certain identities and are invested with emotional and ideological significance. Thus, when the historian Abdul Qadir Badaoni reports about King Akbar, that he diluted the Muslim identity in India deliberately, he mentions that the distinctive Arabic graphemes, which emphasized Arabic and Muslim identity, 'as the (ث) sē, (ع) ain, (ح) hē, (ص) suād, (ض) zuād and (ظ) zōē were avoided' (Badaoni in Blochmann 1873: 205). The printed word has to be in a script which is also indexed to identity.

Though the indexation of the Perso-Arabic script of Urdu with Muslim identity was taken for granted, such was not the case of the Devanagari script. In this case there were rivals; the Kaesthi or Kaethi script and other versions of it called Mahajani and Sarrafi. While Kaithi was used by more pupils in the North Western Provinces in the early 1850s (various education reports of the NWP), it was not used by powerful people. It was also not preferred by the British officials who administered the schools and bought textbooks from the printing presses. The Devanagari script was promoted by the educational system as well, at least in part by the army, which printed manuals in it as early as in 1824, wrote the names of villages for the sake of accuracy in it and used it in certain domains of revenue surveying (Bayly 1996: 158). And, even more importantly, the emerging Hindi Movement did not favour it on the grounds that it was the script of Hindi or Hindustani not of Sanskrit. Moreover, it was the script of Kaesths, rather than the Brahmins. And, as Alok Rai tells us, the 'antagonism between the Kayasthas and the Brahmins has been one of the great organising (and disorganising) principles of public life in the Hindi heartland' (Rai 2001: 52). Thus, the

indexation of the Hindu identity was with the Devanagari script and Sanskritic diction. But this has been mentioned only in passing as this chapter is about the emergence of Urdu as a language of print in India.

Thus, the major concern of this chapter is to trace out the history of printing and publication in Urdu in the present-day Uttar Pradesh area and the Punjab, with reference to the relationship between the printed word and identity-construction for that language. While there is, inevitably, some overlap between the ground covered by Christopher King about printing in Urdu and Hindi (King 1994: 41–48), Bhatnagar, regarding Urdu and Hindi journalism (Bhatnagar 1947: 109–113 and 239–258), and Orsini on printing and publication in Hindi and the public consciousness it created (2002: 48–80), this chapter also covers new ground to be mentioned later.

Our starting point is King's conclusion that between 1868 and 1925 'publications in languages representing the Hindu heritage (chiefly Sanskrit, Hindi, Sanskrit-Hindi, and Hindi-Sanskrit) generally increased, sometimes dramatically' (King 1994: 37). This change is attributed, both by King and other authors who have written on the subject, to the mobilization of the Hindu and Muslim identities during this period. This chapter offers additional information of the same process in the Punjab while King confines himself to the present-day UP area. Additionally, it will examine school textbooks and the way the language they were written in contributed to the kind of identity construction referred to above. It also looks at other effects of printing on the consciousness of Indian Muslims.

Let us begin by examining the effect of printing on the construction and expression of religious (Islamic) identities and attitudes. In the Indian 'ecumene'—a word used by Bayly—there was much debate even in the pre-print era. But 'print added a powerful new weapon to the arsenal of debate within the ecumene' (Bayly 1996: 191). And this weapon was the wide

availability of all kinds of reading material, especially poetry and religious texts. Earlier (in 1615), Edward Terry noted that Indians are otherwise intelligent yet he found 'little learning' and explains it on the 'penury of Books. Which are but few, and they, Manuscripts:' (Purchas 1905: 31). Sulaiman Nadvi also tells us that books on Hadis literature were hard to find in India (Nadvi 1968: 70–76). According to the biographer of Maulana Qasim Nanautvi, the books, even whose names were not known to our present generations, are now available in every home' (Gilani 1373/1954, Vol. 1: 197). And even when Deoband had been established, there were complaints of non-availability of books, so that publishers and printers were asked to come to the help of the madrassa which many, notably Naval Kishore, did (Azhar 1985: 93–94 and 48). Whereas manuscripts were expensive and difficult to find, the printed products—pamphlets, tracts, books, almanacs, prayerbooks, etc.—were much cheaper and more widely available.

A number of presses, and even periodicals, soon started publishing religious material for public consumption. The Mufīd-ē-Ām press, for instance, published Ahl-e-Hadith literature (Metcalf 1982: 204) and the biggest indigenously owned press, the Naval Kishore Press, published a lot of writings about Islam (Stark 2008: 285–291) and also Hinduism (Ibid., 391–397). But for these writings there would not have been so much awareness about religious identity. And as these writings were increasingly in Urdu, in the case of Islamic literature, the association of this language with the Islamic identity in India grew stronger. Most of the literature that will be referred to in this chapter, owes its wide diffusion and deep imprint upon the Muslim consciousness in South Asia because of the role of the printing press.

But, as pointed out by Francis Robinson, it was precisely because of the loss of control over the written word that the ulema were initially distrustful of print. In their view, it was the traditional method of oral transmission which kept the authority

of the author intact (Robinson 1996: 72). The availability of large numbers of religious works, ironically, undermined the authority of the traditional ulema creating modernist, fundamentalist and other contenders for the Islamic space. The other changes are summed up by Francis Robinson as follows:

> We have also seen how the psychological effects of print have played their part in working major developments: the process of distancing, which helped to bring about the new historical consciousness, the reification of religion and the emphasis on this-worldly action; and the process of interiorization which is manifest in an increasingly personal and private encounter with the Quran and a new and yet more powerful focus on the person of the Prophet in Muslim piety (Robinson 1996: 90).

Another scholar who has written on the role of printing in disseminating religious literature, especially of the Tariqāh Muhammadiya, is Harlan O. Pearson, who gives a brief history of the acceptance and use of the printing press of the Islamist reformers, mentioned previously, for their own purposes (Pearson 2008: 90–126). In this context J.R. Colvin reports in 1832.

> It is to be remarked as a new feature in the history of efforts for the propagation of Mohammedanism, or for the reform of its corruptions, how extensively the emissaries of this sect have availed themselves of the press to disseminate their tenets (Colvin 1832: 481).

Indeed, it appears that Muslims were quite enthusiastic about using the press even as readers. As Farhan Nizami points out, 'the circulation lists of newspapers at least for the late 1840s, give the impression that a large proportion of the subscribers were Muslims' (Nizami 1983: 189).

Another important insight is that not only did the nature of text-production change, but there was also a corresponding change in the consumption of the text. While the earlier pattern

had been that individual books, rather than subjects, were studied, the new one was that subjects, themes and ideas were studied and a much larger number of texts were used for this. In this context, Rolf Engelsing's idea of a 'reading revolution', in the sense that from intensive reading of a limited number of texts the reader now did 'extensive' reading of a large number of them, provides useful insights into what was happening in India (Engelsing and Jackson 2004). People no longer depended upon a certified teacher to read one book in the manuscript form but were at liberty to read a number of books on their own, at their convenience, while doing paid jobs rather than being students dependent on charity.

This mass consumption of the printed text produced a transformation of religious thought explained by Elizabeth Eisenstein in a study of print upon Western religious thought. She points out that when literature came to be consumed *en masse*, two opposite trends were perceptible in Europe: 'Erasmian' ideas leading to modernism and orthodoxy leading to fundamentalism (Eisenstein 1979, Vol. 1: 366–367). It is not clear to what extent such insights can be lifted out of their context (in this case early-modern Europe) to explain colonial South Asian Islam but these two opposing trends are, nevertheless, visible from the nineteenth century till date. The traditional Sufi, folk Islam (low church in Gellner's parlance [1983: 74]) based as it was on the oral narration of anecdotes from the lives of the saints receded before the onslaught of written pamphlets, magazines, newspapers, and books. Thus, the authority of the Sufi, ultimately a mental construct based upon unexamined anecdotes about the saints' powers, which could challenge the military power of the rulers in medieval times (Hussain 2009), could no longer function in a society in which analytical habits of reasoning encouraged questioning of the magical nature of the anecdotes and the power which was contingent upon it. So what replaced folk Islam was Islam, as interpreted by written and printed texts by the

various sects, sub-sects, intellectual groups, and ideological camps. Indeed, print probably 'intensified the inner debate within Islam and paved the way for the subsequent growth of different religious movements' (Nizami 1983: 190). Even the religious militants, such as the groups loosely called the Taliban in Pakistan, have a large printed set of works which they disseminate through their mosque and other informal networks (PIPS 2010). Also, a large number of works in Urdu, refuting other sects, heresies and western philosophies, are in circulation all over Pakistan and India (Rahman 2008b). In short, while print did create modernist as well as orthodox—if that term is used to include revivalism, fundamentalism and even militant inter-pretations of Islam—discourses in South Asia their subsequent trajectories differ from that of Europe. At the moment, it appears that the strength of the reaction to modernity, disseminated by print as well as the electronic media, is much stronger in the Urdu-using world than we have seen in the West.

Let us now take up printing and publication in relation to the Urdu-Hindi controversy. Figures from the area now roughly included in UP, given by King (1994: 43–47), may be supplemented by including more data than given earlier. For the Punjab, although figures on printing are used in other contexts, there is no in-depth study of this phenomenon.

Briefly, in the NWP and Oudh, Urdu replaced Persian as the language of the elite and dominated the world of printing till the end of the nineteenth century. After that, despite the fact that it remained the language of the lower domains of power (notably the courts and schools), it was outstripped by Hindi. However, it was in the domain of the publication of books other than those used in schooling—where school textbooks in Hindi were always printed in greater numbers than those in Urdu—where Urdu outstripped Hindi earlier (Annexure-A/12). In periodical literature (newspapers, magazines etc) Urdu held out for longer

and it was only in the twentieth century that the trend was reversed (Annexure-B/12).

The first year in which the Hindi newspapers took the lead on Urdu was 1918–19 (134 in Urdu and 140 in Hindi). This happened, despite the fact that Urdu was still the language of lower-level employment in UP and according to some, to start and maintain a 'Hindi journal of the same dimensions as Urdu costs several times more' (Bhatnagar 1947: 240). The circulation of papers started exceeding those of Urdu from 1911 onwards as the following table shows:

Table 4					
Showing the Number of Subscribers					
Years	Hindi	Urdu	Total	Percentage	
				Hindi	Urdu
1891	8,002	16,256	24,258	32.9	67.1
1901	17,419	23,747	41,176	42.0	58.0
1911	77,731	76,608	154,339	50.3	49.7
1922	215,124	140,486	355,970	60.4	39.6
1931	335,438	150,556	385,998	60.9	39.1
1936	324,880	182,485	507,365	64.0	36.0
Source: Bhatnagar 1947: 257.					

As mentioned earlier, most administration reports of the North Western Provinces, Oudh and the Punjab point out that either religion, language or literature were the subject of most of the publications.

Yet another aspect of identity-formation created by print is the idea of an international Muslim community. News reached much faster than ever before and the Muslims of India reacted to the news if Muslims were involved. For instance, during the Turko-Greek war, reported in the administration report of 1900, at least 'three original works' were published during the year

(Adm. NWP and O 1901: 194). Again, during 1910–11, foreign affairs—concerning Turkey and Persia—were only discussed by the Muslim Press (Adm. UP 1912 a: 53). According to Naeem Qureshi, a scholar of the Khilafat Movement, 'The Muslim press, as usual, was full of denunciations of the "Italian brigandage"' (Qureshi 1999: 35). And during the Khilafat Movement, the Muslim Press—and to a certain extent even the Hindu Press—devoted much more space to Turkey than ever before. In those days there was a special department of propaganda which 'also published a weekly bulletin in Urdu called the *Khilafat-i-'Usmaniyya*. Later, it was turned into a daily newspaper and the title was shortened to just the *Khilafat*. Its circulation jumped to several thousand before it dropped around 1927 to about 1400' (Qureshi 2009: 86). The role of the press, especially with reference to the *Oudh Akhbār* and the *Zamindār*, which shaped public opinion in the areas of our interest, can be gauged by looking at their copies during the Khilafat agitation (1918 to 1924). Naeem Qureshi refers to ten Urdu dailies and five weeklies and fortnightlies in his book which published extensively on the politics of the Khilafat issue (Qureshi 1999: 481). Gail Minault writes about Urdu poetry written during this period and the examples she quotes indicate that categories could be blurred in such ephemeral writings: these poems were both in the dailies and the anthologies; they were political as well as religious. She especially represents the work of Zafar Ali Khan, Hasrat Mohani, and Muhammad Ali who 'were all journalists and consummate orators' (Minault 1974: 463). In short, the consciousness of a Muslim community transcending the borders of India was created by the press. And it is this sense of a worldwide Muslim *millat* which evokes so much anger among Pakistani Muslims about what are seen as Christian transgressions in Bosnia, Israeli aggressiveness towards the Palestinians and American attacks on Iraq and Afghanistan. The roots of this consciousness of a worldwide community and victimhood were created by the

impact of the printed word upon Indian Muslims during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The politics of India were, of course, a perennial theme in publications—especially the newspapers. The *Administration Reports* of 1912–13 mention that the Urdu-Hindi controversy was waging in the press (Adm. UP 1914: 48). And another report, that of 1915–16, observes that the 'predominant tone of most of the publications was one of bitter polemic. The Hindi enthusiasts would like to abolish Urdu at once and English later' (Adm. UP 1916b: 54). The Urdu enthusiasts, not to be left behind, wanted Hindi to be abolished. The press both created and reflected biases which did not gain such wide currency and intensity before the printed word entered the realm of public consciousness.

The number of newspapers mattered less than their circulation. In this matter, up to the end of the nineteenth century in UP and till the 1947 partition in the Punjab, Urdu papers had the largest circulation. Even in 1898, when the Hindi movement was gaining strength, the 'circulation of the Urdu daily, the *Oudh Akhbār*, slightly rose from 521 to 526 during the year; but that of the Hindi daily, the *Hindustān*, remained stationary, being 470, as it was during 1896' (Adm. NWP and O 1899: 189). But by 1923–24 Hindi was triumphant both in the number of newspapers as well as their circulation. The report of this year says:

> Only 8 daily newspapers—four in English, three in Hindi, and one in Urdu—had circulations of over 2000 copies daily. Among weeklies, the largest circulation was that of a Hindi newspaper with 14,000 copies (Adm. UP 1925: 91).

By this time, it may be noted, 'Hindi publications [books etc] accounted for 55 per cent of the total number' and Urdu came next with a 15 per cent share (Adm. UP 1926: 110). So, both in newspapers and books, the language of mass communication of UP in the twentieth century was Hindi not Urdu.

TEXTBOOKS IN PRINT AND IDENTITY POLITICS

The textbook at the school level, being the only reading material available to the teacher and the taught, played a central role in disseminating information, values and attitudes in India (Kumar 1991: 131). However, even at higher levels, where other material is available, the material to be included in the syllabi is chosen, students guides are printed to give one privileged interpretation which is memorized without questioning and, therefore, a certain cultural message is conveyed and reinforced at all levels of education. As Krishna Kumar tells us: 'The teaching of Hindi at college level, and the subsequent starting of Hindi departments in universities in the first quarter of this century made a major contribution towards the success of the Hindi literati's cultural agenda' (Kumar 1991: 129–130). Francesca Orsini has written much about the textbooks in Hindi in schools and universities which have partly covered some of the ground being covered here (Orsini 2002: 92–111). However, without repeating the same details for Urdu, it is necessary to touch upon the major outlines of the controversy of the language of textbooks since it contributed to the way print contributed to the hardening of religious identities in North India.

By the 1870s, the writers of reports were commenting on the problem of the language of the textbooks used in schools. Kempson, the DPI of NWP, points out that the issue arose because of the agitation of the Hindu community against the use of Urdu in courts. He then adds that the 'archaism of the Pundits and the unnatural mannerism of the Moulvies are equally objectionable' (Edn. NWP 1874: 138). The battle for linguistic purity—which was Persianization in the case of Urdu and Sanskritization in that of Hindi—continued and a report of 1884 tells us that the Hindi primer is ready but 'some Hindi purists will probably say that their language is not Hindi' (Edn. NWP and O 1884: 131). Sanskritization was complained against, at least in the case of school textbooks even more than Persianization, though several

decisions were made to counter both. The report of 1875–76 makes the point that the Urdu books represent the spoken language much more than the Hindi ones which 'contain something very different' (Edn. O 1876: 4–5). The 1903 report tells us what the authorities had decided to do about this state of affairs:

> It has been decided that the language should be the vernacular of the provinces, and the words of Persian origin in common use should not be expunged and less familiar Sanskrit words substituted' (Edn. UP 1903: 42).

Textbooks were accordingly revised but to no avail

The dissemination of textbooks for schools was a major problem for the British. When the decision was made in the early part of the nineteenth century that this had to be done in 'Oordoo and Hindee' one British officers thought, the 'Hindoostanee language is at present exceedingly deficient' to express modern, scientific thought. Yet, continues this officer, Hindi 'is inferior to Urdu' and will naturally fall 'into desuetude' (Edn. NWP 1844: 3–7). Another officer, C.C. Fink, superintendent of Vernacular Schools, thought it would 'be wise to discourage the cultivation of Oordoo as much as possible, because its use is not so general as that of Hindee' (Edn. NWP 1846: Lxxiii). The Government, however, ignored both views and continued using both Urdu and Hindi for education.

The Delhi Vernacular Society, and several other such societies, kept printing Urdu and Hindi books throughout British rule in India. Indeed, there were many societies which disseminated the printed word in Urdu in the nineteenth century and the middle of the twentieth century (Ullah 1988). They are mentioned in the reports compiled by the British, and the lists of works printed by them are also given in some cases. Otherwise, too, the reports often have lists of printed works. For instance, the lists of the earliest printed works from 1845–46, including the poetical work of Mir Dard, are available in the report of that year (Edn. NWP

1847: xix). As scientific subjects were also taught in Urdu there was need for neologism. Thus, a list of Urdu scientific terms was prepared for the Engineering College at Roorkee, and was praised in the report of the year as 'a most important desideratum' (Edn. NWP 1853a: 75). Lists of books on mensuration, land revenue, legal matters, and even military subjects were published and widely disseminated. By 1863–64 it was reported that the total number of copies of educational books sold in the last three years was '3,88,302 [of] value Rs 70,824' (Edn. NWP 1864: 60). Indeed, but for the means of mass printing and dissemination of Urdu material, which the British colonial state brought to India, both Urdu and Hindi would have remained far less powerful and standardized than they are at present.

Meanwhile, the language of the printed material kept getting polarized. The Education Department of the United Provinces noted the divergence in the readers for schools and got the prose ones replaced. But the poetry textbooks still remained divergent, though money was offered for producing similar readers for Urdu and Hindi (Edn. UP 1907: 69). These, however, were criticized as their vocabulary was not 'rich enough' (Edn. UP 1909: 39). So, in addition to the annual general meeting, as many as fourteen meetings of the sub-committees were held to consider the revised readers (Edn. UP 1911: 16). Indeed, since the textbooks of 1907 had raised more acute consciousness about vocabulary, new textbooks were commissioned in 1912 (Edn. UP 1912: 107).

The efforts to create common readers went on and the education report of 1917 tells us that the Pigott committee decided that Hindi and Urdu be taught as distinctive languages. However, at the primary level there would be a common reader printed in the Devanagari and the Perso-Arabic script. After that there would be supplementary readers in Hindi and Urdu (Edn. UP 1918: 61–66). This did not help matters as in 1939 there were the same complaints against 'over-Persianization and over-

Sanskritization' and, it was conceded that 'Hindustani literature will grow slowly in time' (Edn. Com 1939: 49).

Yet another attempt was the creation of a Hindustani Academy in 1927 precisely to encourage publications in the common language of Hindus and Muslims of North India. It published a journal called *Hindustani*, as well as books both in Urdu and Hindi. By 1941, this body was lingering on but without much enthusiasm (Edn. UP 1941: 69). It did not succeed in bridging the gap between the two variants of the same language created by politics. And this was not surprising considering that vocabulary functioned as a symbol of communal identity and, therefore, it had to diverge to underline the distance from the 'other' under the political circumstances which prevailed in North India before the partition.

URDU PRINTING IN THE PUNJAB

The British spread Urdu in the Punjab by making it the language of administration, courts and schooling. R.N. Cust, a protégé of Thomason of the NWP fame, wrote a manual for his native subordinates called *Fihrist Dastūr Amal Faujdārī* (List of the regulations for criminal cases) in easy Urdu. And this was only the beginning since works of this kind, as well as textbooks in Urdu, proliferated. The most detailed bibliographical essay on the printed literature of the Muslims of the Punjab in the nineteenth century is by Edward Churchill (1975). This section draws both upon the sources identified by Churchill and upon other sources. In a nutshell, most of the printed word in the Punjab—both in the category of 'books' and 'periodicals' were in Urdu, from the 1850s onwards. Although Churchill uses the variable of religion (Muslim) rather than language for most of the tables he has compiled on publication in the Punjab, the two categories can be conflated with little loss of accuracy. For instance, although his table of periodical literature is about the publications of Muslims, it is also about Urdu because 'Muslims

produced only 3 out of 24 English periodicals, no Punjabi or Hindi periodicals and only 5 out of 12 bilingual periodicals: 3 English-Urdu, 1 Hindi-Urdu, 1 Urdu-Dogra. This is further indication of the fact that publications were controlled by the Urdu knowing Muslims' (Churchill 1975: 263). Thus, it was only slowly that Punjabi, written mostly in the Gurmukhi but also in the Shahmukhi scripts came to claim its share of printed material. Even by the turn of the century, when Punjabi had increased its share in publishing by 20 per cent. Urdu was still at 47 per cent even excluding the textbooks used in schools (Adm. Pun 1902 b: 182).

Educational books approved by the Textbook committee, or the sub-committees for Urdu, Hindi and Gurmukhi, were required by the huge network of schools and other institutions—such as the Lahore Medical School—for students and teachers. The Mufid-i-Am Press, like its counterpart the Neval Kishore Press in Lucknow, printed a large share of these books under contracts from the government (Adm. Pun 1898: 264). By 1911–12, Urdu was still used in 48 per cent of the publications, but Punjabi had carved out a 35 per cent share for itself (Adm. Pun 1913: 194). It was only in 1915 that Punjabi took the lead over Urdu and this happened because Delhi had been excluded from the Punjab and then, it must be noted, it happened only in the category for 'books' (Adm. Pun 1915: 67) (Annexure-C/12). The periodical publications (i.e. category 'newspapers') continued to be published predominantly in Urdu till the division of the Punjab in 1947 (Annexure-D/12).

It must, however, be noted that there was what may be called the 'Muslim' style. The 1912–13 report tells us that, 'About one-quarter of the "Punjabi" books are more Urdu than Punjabi, being written by Muhammadans in Persian script and containing a large proportion of Persian and Arabic words' (Adm. Pun 1914: 87). The same can be said for Urdu books from the Punjab. For instance, the *Tafsīr-ē-Qurān Majīd Bazubān-ē-Hindi* (The Exegesis

of the Glorious Quran in the Hindi Language) of Maulvi
Mohammad Din, though purporting to be in 'Hindi' (Urdu), is
actually in a language between Punjabi and Urdu. The author is
from Amritsar and he uses words like '*changā*' (good), *vadā* (big),
vich (in) which are normally used in Punjabi whereas the other
words are of Urdu (Mohammad n.d.: 2).

In the Punjab, as in UP, religious works proliferated as
Churchill's work mentioned earlier indicates (Churchill 1975).
The *Administration Report* of 1865–66 tells us that '77 works
related to religion were published out of which 57, with a print
run of 57,556, were Muslim and 20 with 76,750 copies were
Hindu' (Adm. Pun 1866: 104). This is the refrain of most
administration reports which place either religion or literature
and language on the top every year (Annexure C/12). Moreover,
as mentioned earlier, there is an overlap of categories. Works
classified as history, poetry, and fiction also contain religious
themes. For instance, the report of 1901–02 informs us that
'Islam usually publishes each year more books on religious
questions than all the other religions put together' (Adm. Pun
1902b: 183). However, both Hindu and Sikh religious works were
published. The 'old fashioned "Janam Sākīs" and "Tazkarās",
lives and teachings of great Sikh and Muslim divines' were
reprinted again and again as they had 'considerable hold on the
popular mind' (Adm. Pun 1908: 61). There were also a number of
polemical publications which have been mentioned in the
chapter on Urdu as an Islamic language. Suffice it to say that 'a
substantial portion however were affected by the divisions
within Islam' and printing sharpened the divide between
different points of view making it possible to reach bigger and
bigger audiences and, in turn, making them conscious of the
divisions within Islam (Churchill 1975: 265).

Not only the number of periodical publications but their
circulation too indicated the dissemination of the printed word
in Urdu to the masses. For instance, during 1915–16, 151 papers

were published from Lahore and Amritsar. Those with over 5,000 circulation were the *Zamindar* (12,000), a daily owned by a Muslims. This was followed by the *Hindustan* (10,000), a weekly owned by Hindus and, again, another weekly called the *Paisa Akhbār* (5,700) owned by Muslims (Adm. Pun 1917: 70). Out of the twenty papers with circulation of over 1,000 there was only one Gurmukhi publication, the *Khālsā Samāchār*. All the other nineteen publications were in Urdu. Punjabi Hindus and Sikhs, in order to empower themselves, used Urdu. In 1923, for instance, the Punjab had 236 publications. Out of these the report tells us, '91 are owned by Hindus, 82 by Muhammadans, and 32 by Sikhs' (Adm. Pun 1923a: 237). Though Hindus did support Hindi and the Sikhs Gurmukhi at the political level, this did not necessarily translate into business practices or educational preferences. Thus the Punjab, much more than any other area of British India, was the heartland of printing and publication in Urdu even when the Hindi movement had turned the tide against Urdu in print in the rest of North India.

URDU AFTER THE PARTITION

The Partition of India into Bharat and Pakistan brought about further changes in the story of the printed word in Urdu in both the new countries. First, let us look at India and then move on to Pakistan. To begin with, in India, the number of Urdu publications decreased with respect to Hindi and also English. Indeed, Urdu became a minor language in the world of print for the first time since it entered this world during British rule. After partition, when Hindi became the major language of use in UP, the share of Urdu decreased even further. In 1970–71, Urdu contributed only 255 titles out of 18,305 titles in the books delivered to the National Library of India (Israel 2000: 128). On the other hand, the percentage of Hindi books was 46.23 and the titles in 1976 were 2,235 (Ibid., 130). During the same period, the number of publishers of Hindi were 2,425 and for Urdu only 596

(Ibid., 132). The Urdu academies provided about 75 per cent aid to writers of Urdu books in 1997 (Burney 1998: 126) when 1,626 titles were produced as against 16,026 in Hindi and a total of 57,386 in all languages of India (Malhotra 1998a: 10–22). In short, the printing and publication of books in Urdu is dependent upon the demand of the madrassas and the help given by Urdu academies and other institutions of the state which provide financial aid in a bid to deflect the criticism of Muslim leaders that Urdu is dying in India.

The story of identity-construction and its relationship with print has another dimension which requires us to address the changes brought about in the consciousness of the Muslim identity among the non-elitist Muslims after the partition. The crucial change which occurred, is that the indexical relationships between the printed word and identity mutated. The generation which grew up with the Hindi-Urdu controversy in the air adhered to the equation of Hindi-Devanagari script= Hindu identity; and Urdu-Perso-Arabic script=Muslim identity, but the new generation of Muslims had to construct new indexalities as the pressures upon them were different. Rizwan Ahmad, after a study of the lower middle class Muslim youth in old Delhi, tells us that Muslims are writing Urdu in the Devanagari script because they are unable to read the Perso-Arabic script any longer. In short the clear indexation of the Devanagari script with the Hindu identity is problematic and this is a response to changing social, economic and political pressures upon the Muslims of India. However, even more interesting is the fact that the printers of Urdu in the Devanagari script have found ways to retain the distinctiveness of Urdu from Hindi. Apart from the vocabulary, which is not Sankritised, the printers have come up with the use of certain orthographic conventions which have been invested with social significance. These are dots (*bindīs*) on certain Devanagari graphemes to represent the distinctive Perso-Arabic sounds present in the phonological inventory of classical

Urdu but not in Hindi. Even the '*ain*' sound, which is not normally spoken in Urdu at all—a schwa sound being used instead—is nevertheless present in the orthography and the Devanagari graphemes are modified to represent it. According to Rizwan Ahmad:

> The efforts to preserve features of Urdu are the articulation of the second generation, who believe that placing *bindīs* under Hindi graphemes is the best way to hand down Urdu in its "correct" form to the next generation. However, for generation–3, *bindīs* cannot override the stigma attached to the phonemes that they are supposed to represent on paper (Ahmad 2007: 191).

In short, the printed word is the most potent tool in the construction of identities and spreads the notion of identity to a much larger public than manuscripts ever could.

In the areas now in Pakistan, both the Gurmukhi and the Devanagari scripts went out of print. Till 1971, the Bangla script, a modified form of the Brahmi script, from which the Devanagari is descended, was used, but after Bangladesh became an independent country, even this came to an end. Urdu and English are now the most dominant languages and the script used for writing Punjabi, Siraiki, Hindko, Balochi, and Brahvi is the same as Urdu. Only Pashto and Sindhi are written in slightly modified variants of the Arabic script. The number of periodicals—including newspapers, weeklies, fortnightlies, etc.—being published in Urdu in Pakistan in 2009 is 1,225 followed by English with 237. The only indigenous language of the country, which comes anywhere near, is Sindhi, with 157 publications (Annexure-E/12). All others lag far behind. As for books received in the National Library the number of Urdu books is 1,287, followed by English with 368 books. There is no data for books in indigenous languages of the country for 2009 but in 2007, 81 and in 2008, 132 books were received (Annexure-F/12). It is a fact, however, that the number of books reported officially is lower than the

actual number of books printed—Jihadi literature, erotica, books on songs, jokes, riddles, magic, folk Islam, etc., are never reported—but this is true for all languages to some extent. However, there is more of indigenous, folk literature of the Jihadi and the erotic kind in Urdu than in any other language in Pakistan. So, to infer that Urdu is the major language of printing and publication in Pakistan would be the correct conclusion.

Many official institutions, like the Urdu Dictionary Board, the Majlis-e-Taraqqi-e-Urdu, the Urdu Science Board, the National Language Authority and the Pakistan Academy of Letters (PAL) publish in Urdu. Between 2005–10, out of 163 publications of the PAL, 134 were in Urdu (Manager Circulation, PAL, 30 April 2010). The NLA's budget for 2010 is Rs 34,033,000 and almost all its publications are in Urdu.

To conclude, the printing press was a product of modernity and, more than anything else, it ushered in modernity in British India. The modern education system, contingent as it is upon the availability of the mass-produced textbooks, was possible only because of it. But, since these textbooks were in Hindi and Urdu—leaving out those in other languages for the time being—the consciousness of the Hindi-based (Hindu) and Urdu-based (mostly Muslim) identities grew at least in North India. Urdu dominated the publication industry, including the newspapers, more than the numbers of its speakers warranted up to the middle of the nineteenth century. This domination was seriously and successfully challenged by Hindi and by the first quarter of the twentieth century it was Hindi which gained dominance over Urdu.

Print also made a large number of religious books available, thus sharpening and heightening the awareness of religious— even sectarian and sub-sectarian—differences. Thus, it sharpened religious differentiation among Muslims just when it was in their political interest to present a united Muslim monolithic identity in opposition to the Hindu 'Other'. But both trends went on with

politics overriding religion when it came to voting and the demand for Pakistan.

In short, printing served two mutually contradictory ends: initially it increased the dominance of Urdu; but eventually it decreased it as Hindi ousted Urdu from the domains it had occupied earlier. The print-supported antagonistic identities from the Hindi-Urdu controversy as expressed in print, survive to this day, as the Devanagari script is dead in Pakistan and the Perso-Arabic script, although surviving in elitist domains, is dying in India. But sound bites die more slowly. Thus, Urdu-Hindi survives on the radio, the television and in films. But here too the centripetal and the centrifugal forces wrenching these two languages apart and bringing them together continue their identity-marking political and social struggle. Let us first turn to the radio.

BOOKS, MONOGRAPH, PAMPHLETS AND MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATIONS

NORTH WESTERN PROVINCES AND OUDH

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Total	% (Urdu)	% (Hindi)	Ratio of Hindi to Urdu
1872	67	11	78	85.90	14.1	1:6.09
1873	54	35	89	60.67	39.3	1:1.54
1880	206	88	294	70.07	29.9	1:2.34
1881	144	74	218	66.06	33.9	1:1.95
1882	380	218	598	63.55	36.5	1:1.74
1883	489	267	756	64.68	35.3	1:1.83
1884	337	201	538	62.64	37.4	1:1.68
1886	238	227	465	51.18	48.8	1:1.05
1887	522	468	990	52.73	47.3	1:1.12
1888	452	262	714	63.31	36.7	1:1.73
1889	558	295	853	65.42	34.6	1:1.89
1890	569	361	930	61.18	38.8	1:1.58
1891	408	213	621	65.70	34.3	1:1.92
1892	301	199	500	60.20	39.8	1:1.51
1893	295	208	503	58.65	41.4	1:1.42
1894	469	306	775	60.52	39.5	1:1.53
1895	623	354	977	63.77	36.2	1:1.76
1896	560	354	914	61.27	38.7	1:1.58
1897	514	230	744	69.09	30.9	1:2.23
1903–04	519	431	950	54.63	45.4	1:1.20

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Total	% (Urdu)	% (Hindi)	Ratio of Hindi to Urdu
1904–05	487	616	1103	44.15	55.8	1:0.79
1905–06	386	517	903	42.75	57.3	1:0.75
1914–15	451	951	1402	32.17	67.8	1:0.47
1915–16	362	942	1304	27.76	72.2	1:0.38
1919–20	286	913	1199	23.85	76.1	1:0.31
1920–21	338	952	1290	26.20	73.8	1:0.36
1921–22	379	1185	1564	24.23	75.8	1:0.32
1922–23	596	1587	2183	27.30	72.7	1:0.38
1925–26	479	1394	1873	25.57	74.4	1:0.34
1927–28	418	2014	2432	17.19	82.8	1:0.21
1928–29	419	1795	2214	18.93	81.1	1:0.23
1929–30	348	1991	2339	14.88	85.1	1:0.17
1930–31	560	2058	2618	21.39	78.6	1:0.27
1930	348	1991	2339	14.88	85.1	1:0.17
1931	560	2058	2618	21.39	78.6	1:0.27
1932	395	1799	2194	18.00	82.0	1:0.22
1933	410	2126	2536	16.17	83.8	1:0.19
1934	344	2240	2584	13.31	86.7	1:0.15
Totals:	**15271**	**31931**	**47202**	**32.35**	**67.6**	

NB: The totals given do not include publications in 'other' languages because only information about the Hindi and Urdu publications are relevant for our purposes.

Sources: For 1872, 1873 see Edn. O 1873: 120 and Edn. NWP 1874: 16; for all dates up to 1930–31 see the relevant *Administration Reports* of the North Western Provinces and Oudh; for the years 1930 to 1934 see Bhatnagar 1947: 275–276 given on the authority of the Minister of Education of UP.

NB: Unless indicated otherwise the sources for the rest of the annexures in this
   chapter are the administration reports of the relevant years of the areas
   given in the headings.

NEWSPAPER, MAGAZINES, PERIODICAL, ETC.
(NWP AND OUDH)

Year	NWP		Oudh		Total	% (Urdu)	% (Hindi)	Ratio of Hindi to Urdu
	Urdu	Hindi	Urdu	Hindi				
1881	38	6	21	0	65	90.77	9.23	1:9.83
1882	46	6	22	1	75	90.67	9.33	1:9.71
1883	50	6	21	1	78	91.03	8.97	1:10.14
1884	48	10	24	0	82	87.80	12.20	1:7.20
1885	51	10	25	1	87	87.36	12.64	1:6.91
1886	54	16	22	3	95	80.00	20.00	1:4
1887	56	14	20	3	93	81.72	18.28	1:4.47
1888	55	11	18	3	87	83.91	16.09	1:5.21
1889	59	13	20	4	96	82.29	17.71	1:4.65
1890	81	19	133	0	233	91.85	8.15	1:11.26
1891	74	14	0	0	88	84.09	15.91	1:5.29
1892	68	24	0	0	92	73.91	26.09	1:2.83
1893	0	26	0	0	26	0.00	100.00	26:00
1894	76	20	109	0	205	90.24	9.76	1:9.25
1895	82	23	119	0	224	89.73	10.27	1:8.74
1896	84	27	121	0	232	88.36	11.64	1:7.59
1897	85	30	123	0	238	87.39	12.61	1:6.93
1898	81	28	118	0	227	87.67	12.33	1:7.11
1899	72	24	105	0	201	88.06	11.94	1:7.38
1900	73	20	104	0	197	89.85	10.15	1:8.85
1901	70	32	109	0	211	84.83	15.17	1:5.59
1902−03	69	30	105	0	204	85.29	14.71	1:5.80
1906−07	89	40	153	0	282	85.82	14.18	1:6.05

Year	NWP		Oudh		Total	% (Urdu)	% (Hindi)	Ratio of Hindi to Urdu
	Urdu	Hindi	Urdu	Hindi				
1907–08	68	35	129	0	232	84.91	15.09	1:5.63
1908–09	63	31	114	0	208	85.10	14.90	1:5.71
1909–10	67	42	123	0	232	81.90	18.10	1:4.52
1910–11	82	56	0	0	138	59.42	40.58	1:1.46
1911–12	81	59	227	0	367	83.92	16.08	1:5.22
1914–15	126	107	317	0	550	80.55	19.45	1:4.14
1915–16	135	133	357	0	625	78.72	21.28	1:3.70
1916–17	131	127	347	0	605	79.01	20.99	1:3.76
1917–18	131	134	352	0	617	78.28	21.72	1:3.60
1918–19	134	140	359	0	633	77.88	22.12	1:3.52
1919–20	138	165	398	0	701	76.46	23.54	1:3.25
1920–21	151	175	427	0	753	76.76	23.24	1:3.30
1921–22	195	226	525	0	946	76.11	23.89	1:3.19
1922–23	215	171	473	0	859	80.09	19.91	1:4.02
1923–24	161	205	455	0	821	75.03	24.97	1:3
1924–25	183	218	513	0	914	76.15	23.85	1:3.19
1925–26	196	246	0	0	442	44.34	55.66	1:0.80
1926–27	219	237	592	0	1048	77.39	22.61	1:3.42
1927–28	243	266	643	0	1152	76.91	23.09	1:3.33
1928–29	234	270	646	0	1150	76.52	23.48	1:3.26
1929–30	224	253	620	0	1097	76.94	23.06	1:3.34
1930–31	225	253	626	0	1104	77.08	22.92	1:3.36
1931–32	262	229	632	0	1123	79.61	20.39	1:3.90
1932–33	239	219	0	0	458	52.18	47.82	1:1.09
1933–34	265	233	0	0	498	53.21	46.79	1:1.14
1934–35	298	229	0	0	527	56.55	43.45	1:1.30
1935–36	299	219	0	0	518	57.72	42.28	1:1.37
1936–37	354	329	0	0	683	51.83	48.17	1:1.08
TOTAL	**6580**	**5456**	**10367**	**16**	**22419**	**75.59**	**24.41**	

BOOKS, MONOGRAPHS, PAMPHLETS, AND OTHER PUBLICATIONS (PUNJAB)

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Gurmukhi/Punjabi	Total	% (Urdu)	% (Hindi)	% (Gurmukhi/Punjabi)	Ratio of Hindi to Urdu	Ratio of Gurmukhi/Punjabi to Urdu
1867–68	119	33	31	183	65.03	18.03	16.94	1:3.61	1:3.84
1868–69	238	32	69	339	70.21	9.44	20.35	1:7.44	1:3.45
1869–70	202	37	23	262	77.10	14.12	8.78	1:5.46	1:8.78
1870–71	150	76	5	231	64.94	32.90	2.16	1:197	1:30
1871–72	148	30	3	181	81.77	16.57	1.66	1:4.93	1:49.33
1872–73	170	67	57	294	57.82	22.79	19.39	1:2.54	1:2.98
1873–74	227	47	64	338	67.16	13.91	18.93	1:4.83	1:3.55
1874–75	210	74	20	304	69.08	24.34	6.58	1:2.84	1:10.50
1876–77	433	120	102	655	66.11	18.32	15.57	1:3.61	1:4.25
1877–78	360	97	114	571	63.05	16.99	19.96	1:3.71	1:3.16
1878–79	437	70	141	648	67.44	10.80	21.76	1:6.24	1:3.10
1879–80	395	101	170	666	59.31	15.17	25.53	1:3.91	1:2.32
1881–82	487	97	206	790	61.65	12.28	26.08	1:5.02	1:2.36
1882–83	483	153	190	826	58.47	18.52	23.00	1:3.16	1:2.54
1883–84	779	163	314	1256	62.02	12.98	25.00	1:4.78	1:2.48

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Gurmukhi/Punjabi	Total	% (Urdu)	% (Hindi)	% (Gurmukhi/ Punjabi)	Ratio of Hindi to Urdu	Ratio of Gurmukhi/ Punjabi to Urdu
1884–85	765	158	258	1181	64.78	13.38	21.85	1:4.84	1:2.97
1885–86	806	230	218	1254	64.27	18.34	17.38	1:3.50	1:3.70
1886–87	824	206	398	1428	57.70	14.43	27.87	1:4.00	1:2.07
1901–02	5763	466	2405	8634	66.75	5.40	27.85	1:12.37	1:2.40
1902–03	521	66	350	937	55.60	7.04	37.35	1:7.89	1:1.49
1903–04	601	0	397	998	60.22	0.00	39.78	0:601	1:1.51
1904–05	614	0	455	1069	57.44	0.00	42.56	0:614	1:1.35
1905–06	881	0	514	1395	63.15	0.00	36.85	0:881	1:1.71
1906–07	708	0	503	1211	58.46	0.00	41.54	0:708	1:1.41
1907–08	491	0	328	819	59.95	0.00	40.05	0:491	1:1.50
1908–09	497	0	0	497	100.00	0.00	0.00	0:497	0:497
1909–10	533	75	0	608	87.66	12.34	0.00	1:7.11	0:533
1910–11	597	82	0	679	87.92	12.08	0.00	1:7.28	0:597
1911–12	751	68	0	819	91.70	8.30	0.00	1:11.04	0:751
1915–16	624	0	0	624	100.00	0.00	0.00	0:624	0:624
1916–17	660	0	0	660	100.00	0.00	0.00	0:660	0:660
TOTAL	20474	2548	7335	30357	67.44	8.39	24.16		

NEWSPAPERS, MAGAZINES AND PERIODICALS (PUNJAB)

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Gurmukhi	Total	% (Urdu)	% (Hindi)	% (Gurmukhi)	Ratio of Hindi to Urdu	Ratio of Gurmukhi to Urdu
1880–81	24	1	1	26	92.31	3.85	3.85	1:24	1:24
1881–82	27	1	1	29	93.10	3.45	3.45	1:27	1:27
1882–83	25	1	1	27	92.59	3.70	3.70	1:25	1:25
1884–85	32	5	1	38	84.21	13.16	2.63	1:6.4	1:32
1885–86	55	2	3	60	91.67	3.33	5.00	1:27.5	1:18
1886–87	68	1	4	73	93.15	1.37	5.48	1:68	1:17
1887–88	67	1	4	72	93.06	1.39	5.56	1:67	1:17
1888–89	75	2	1	78	96.15	2.56	1.28	1:37.5	1:75
1889–90	72	2	1	75	96.00	2.67	1.33	1:36	1:72
1890–91	63	4	0	67	94.03	5.97	0.00	1:15.75	0:63
1891–92	67	3	1	71	94.37	4.23	1.41	1:22.33	1:67
1892–93	61	2	1	64	95.31	3.13	1.56	1:30.5	1:61
1893–94	73	2	3	78	93.59	2.56	3.85	1:36.5	1:24
1894–95	77	2	3	82	93.90	2.44	3.66	1:38.5	1:26
1895–96	86	1	2	89	96.63	1.12	2.25	1:86	1:43
1896–97	65	2	5	72	90.28	2.78	6.94	1:32.5	1:13
1897–98	57	2	4	63	90.48	3.17	6.35	1:28.5	1:14
1898–99	79	4	4	87	90.80	4.60	4.60	1:19.75	1:20
1900–01	115	7	6	128	89.84	5.47	4.69	1:16.43	1:19

Year	Urdu	Hindi	Gurmukhi	Total	% (Urdu)	% (Hindi)	% (Gurmukhi)	Ratio of Hindi to Urdu	Ratio of Gurmukhi to Urdu
1901–02	137	7	4	148	92.57	4.73	2.70	1:19.57	1:34
1902–03	143	6	3	152	94.08	3.95	1.97	1:23.83	1:48
1903–04	165	6	7	178	92.70	3.37	3.93	1:27.5	1:24
1904–05	175	7	9	191	91.62	3.66	4.71	1:25	1:19
1905–06	192	9	11	212	90.57	4.25	5.19	1:21.33	1:17
1906–07	183	11	13	207	88.41	5.31	6.28	1:16.64	1:14
1907–08	192	13	15	220	87.27	5.91	6.82	1:14.77	1:13
1908–09	182	11	18	211	86.26	5.21	8.53	1:16.55	1:10
1909–10	206	9	23	238	86.55	3.78	9.66	1:22.89	1:9
1910–11	178	9	19	206	86.41	4.37	9.22	1:19.77	1:9.4
1911–12	171	13	22	206	83.01	6.31	10.68	1:13.15	1:7.8
1912–13	173	11	25	209	82.78	5.26	11.96	1:15.73	1:6.9
1913–14	174	11	22	207	84.06	5.31	10.63	1:15.82	1:7.9
1914–15	175	13	29	217	80.65	5.99	13.36	1:13.46	1:6
1915–16	177	12	26	215	82.33	5.58	12.09	1:14.75	1:6.8
1916–17	167	9	4	180	92.78	5.00	2.22	1:18.56	1:42
1917–18	171	10	22	203	84.24	4.93	10.84	1:17.1	1:7.8
1918–19	176	9	21	206	85.44	4.37	10.19	1:19.56	1:8.4
1919–20	178	10	26	214	83.18	4.67	12.15	1:17.8	1:6.8
1920–21	178	15	31	224	79.46	6.70	13.84	1:11.87	1:5.7
TOTAL	4681	246	396	5323	87.94	4.62	7.44		

NUMBER OF NEWSPAPERS/PERIODICALS
PUBLISHED IN PAKISTAN–2009

Periodicity	Urdu	English	Punjabi	Sindhi	Pushto	Baluchi	Sariaki	Gujarati	Arabic	Total
Dailies No	498	97	8	71	8	2	3	3	1	691
Weekies No	347	45	-	42	2	-	-	-	-	436
Fortnightlies No	60	12	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	75
Monthlies No	309	80	-	41	3	11	2	-	-	446
Quarterlies No	10	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12
Annual No	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Source: GOP 2009.										

DETAILED LIST OF BOOKS PUBLISHED IN PAKISTAN

Year	English	Urdu	Regional Languages	Total
1992	346	920	-	1266
1993	455	1132	-	1587
1994	825	2217	-	3042
1995	870	2233	-	3103
2006	734	1430	-	2164
2007	440	1037	81	1558
2008	647	1077	132	1856
2009	368	1287	-	1655
Source: *Pakistan National Bibliography* 2010.				

13

Urdu on the Radio

We have looked at the way the print media revolutionized the ways Indians consumed information and entertainment. However, what had at least as much, possibly even greater, impact was the radio. Being a largely illiterate society, the printed word could not reach as many people as could the spoken word. The radio could communicate discourses not created by face-to-face interaction for millions. Thus, discoveries originating from outside one's community could impinge upon one's worldview. Here was information unimagined and entertainment at a scale hitherto unknown. It had an impact upon thought, again at the same gigantic scale. Hence we shall explore the role of the language used in the radio in British India and to a lesser degree in independent India and Pakistan. This study will help us understand yet another aspect of the construction and expression of the nationalist Muslim and Hindu identities in South Asia in relation to Urdu which we have been exploring in the other chapters.

Broadcasting began in the 1920s in India, and the government was so aware of its potential to influence public opinion that attempts to control it began almost immediately. Initially, there were radio clubs in Calcutta, Bombay and Madras, but in 1927, an Indian Broadcasting Company was licensed. This ceased to function in 1930, when the Government of India set up its own radio stations with Delhi as the headquarter of the All India Radio (AIR). In 1937, English and thirteen Indian languages were used in the AIR programmes, but it was widely recognized that

the language of the great northern plains must be 'Urdu or Hindustani' (Radio. 1937).

When the Second World War intervened (1939–1945), the radio was recruited as part of the war effort. Not only the British, but also the Germans and the Italians were using the radio for propaganda. The language they chose was predominantly Hindustani, often called only 'Urdu' in the reports, about these activities. The Urdu broadcast from Rome was by one Ajit Singh. An official, probably the Under Secretary of State for India, wrote:

> We are consulting the DG (Director General, Ministry of Information) on the continuation of monitoring broadcasts from Russia and Italy in Indian languages (Radio. 1940).

When broadcasts from other countries in support of the Allies were considered, they too would be in Hindustani. About the United States, it was stated that the radio audience would be between 1,000,000 to 1,200,000, and out of this one third listened to English and about the same number to Hindustani. The telegram ended with the following conclusion.

> On the whole, we think Hindustani is the only Indian language which might be considered (Radio. 1942).

Once the Soviet Union joined the Allies, efforts were made to get the Russians to broadcast in 'Hindustani and Punjabi'. Ambassador Kuibyshev of the Soviet Union was told that Berlin is popular and pernicious and, therefore, more people will listen to Russia than Berlin (7 July 1942). Later, the Ambassador was requested to drop Punjabi, leaving only Hindustani in the field (2 Aug 1942). The Government of India made it clear to the Soviets that their efforts, would be a useful counter to Berlin and Tokyo' (12 May 1942) (Radio. 1942: 12 May Report).

The language of the broadcaster, which was much commented upon, was important because the message had to be disseminated to as many people as possible. Sometimes it was feared that the quality of the language used by the enemy might give them an advantage. In a letter complaining about the Persianized diction of Z.A. Bukhari, the Director of the AIR writes:

> It may be mentioned that in contrast the choice of words of the Berlin News announcer is very fortunate in reaching the listeners (Radio. Ltr 1940a).

Moreover, the Hindi-Urdu controversy was making headlines despite the War in India. A press conference held on 1 August 1938 at Simla said:

> At Delhi Station we have two translators one for Hindi and one for Urdu, who work together to produce as good bulletins as they can. Such a bulletin will not be pleasing to the stylist, because it is a conglomeration of the two languages. It probably offends the stylists just as Basic English offends the literary people of England, but that is the only way we can work at present, we must try to find as simple a language as possible which will be understood by all (Radio. Note. 1938).

There are several telegrams giving the reactions to the language of broadcasts in 'Hindustani'. One telegram (7 June 1940) says:

> Criticisms are as usual—too high flown, too much Urdu. Fielden will know from experience in A.I.R. how much value to attach to these criticisms, but it is well to keep the language simple except where matter requires something else (Radio. Ltr 1940b).

In another letter, the language of Z.A. Bukhari is specifically discussed.
'The style was as dramatic as before and there was the usual display of phraseology.' (Radio. Ltr 1940a).

At another place the same source says:

> In fact, the stylistic elegance which lends it a rare literary charm
> appears to militate against the appeal of the news bulletin (Radio.
> Ltr 1940a).

This indeed is the refrain of a number of letters and telegrams.
The style of the broadcasts was accused of being elitist, decadent,
flowery, Persianized, and poetic. At one point it is facetiously
pointed out that the Berlin announcer will begin:

> You have been listening on—Metres from the BBC to a reading of
> poetry and now here is the news (Ibid.) (Radio. Ltr 1940 a).

THE IMPACT OF Z.A. BUKHARI

Syed Zulfiqar Ali Bukhari (1904–1975), younger brother of Ahmad
Shah Pitras Bukhari (1898–1958), was a high-ranking, pioneering
official of the All India Radio. He joined the Radio in 1935 and
soon became a favourite of Lionel Fielden, the Controller of All-
India Radio. His brother, Pitras Bukhari, was also selected by
Fielden and was made the Director of the Delhi station. Later
Pitras became the Deputy Controller of All-India radio and
Z.A. Bukhari became the Assistant Director. Seeing this, Divan
Singh Maftoon, editor of *Riāsat*, started calling BBC the Bukhari
Brothers Corporation (Bukhari 1966: 22).

Bukhari was biased against Hindi as testified by his auto-
biography entitled *Sarguzasht*, (1966). He shows his bias against
Hindus at various places in this book. For instance, he declares
that music too was the prerogative of Muslims and that all who
became popular on the stage were Muslims. Bukhari was against
Hindustani which he sometimes called the language of the
Congress (Bukhari 1966: 140). The style of language used by
educated Muslims, being full of Persian and Arabic words, was
literary Urdu and it was this which Bukhari promoted and used

himself. His biography too is full of Persian phrases, couplets and *mot justes* which do not make for intelligibility. At one time, when a Congress minster with the name of Munshi (the word means clerk in Arabic) asked him to use easy language and to avoid Arabic words, he told him that his name too was Arabic (Bukhari 1966: 129–130).

Bukhari's Persianized Urdu was often unintelligible for listeners as already evident from the documents quoted earlier. He was, however, unrepentant. In his autobiography be defends his style at length.

> What kind of Urdu would that be which does not have the flavour of Arabic and Persian. Urdu literature can only be understood by people who have some competence in Arabic and Persian. When we looked at all these requirements we reached the conclusion that this work can be better done by Muslims (Bukhari 1966: 119).

In short, by Hindustani, Z.A. Bukhari meant 'Urdu', and Urdu had to be Persianized, otherwise it would lose its literary charm. This decision led to the hiring of Muslims as broadcasters, while the engineers and other workers were Hindus to balance them out (Bukhari 1966: 119). At another place Z A. Bukhari says that those who keep reiterating that he should use simple Urdu should have learnt new words. If they had learnt even one word in a month they would have known 900 words and would not have clamoured for easy language (Ibid., 120). But it was not a matter of ignorance; it was actually a matter of identity because the Perso-Arabic diction was a symbol of elitist Muslim identity while the Sanskritic one indexed the Hindu identity.

In short, despite demands for simplification both by the British and the Hindu listeners, the Muslims dominant in the AIR did not deign to simplify their linguistic style to use the common man's language. 'Hindustani', the so-called composite language of North India, remained elusive on the radio because, as mentioned earlier, Z.A. Bukhari refused to accept it as an

authentic language (Bukhari 1966: 120). For Bukhari it was simply the prejudice of Hindus which made them protest against the 'difficult Urdu' of the AIR. The demand for Hindustani, declared Bukhari, which had been strengthened by M.K. Gandhi, was simply a product of Hindu prejudice (Ibid., 119–121). He did not think speakers of languages other than Urdu—especially if they were Hindus—could speak Urdu correctly. For instance, he says about Lata Mangeshkar's father, who had been recommended for singing Urdu songs: 'I repeatedly said that he is a Maratha; how will he sing in Urdu' (Bukhari 1966: 163).

When he was Director of the Bombay Station, Bukhari sent a questionnaire to all licence-holders of the radio. The main question was as to which language they wanted to hear in the programmes. The answers were:

Gujarati and Urdu	30 per cent
Marathi and Urdu	20 per cent
Only Gujarati	25 per cent
Only Marathi	15 per cent
Only Urdu	10 per cent
(Source: Bukhari 1966: 156)	

Bukhari decided that the programmes will be announced in Urdu. However, if a feature was in Gujarati and Marathi then, in addition to Urdu, it will also be announced in that language (Ibid., 157). He also tells us that he received almost all letters in Urdu and replied to them in the same language. He also conducted a programme for children in Urdu (Ibid., 157–158).

From July, the journal of AIR called *Āvāz* (voice), which was published in both Hindi and Urdu, came to be published as two journals: *Āvāz* (voice) in Urdu and *Sārang* (coloured, beautiful, melodious) in Hindi (Siddiqi 1998: 45). This indicated, and also reinforced, the separation of the two languages and the growing loss of the middle ground, i.e. Hindustani. The Directorate

General of Broadcasting did, however, instruct all radio stations to decrease the chasm between Urdu and Hindi by developing Hindustani. However, despite some official efforts, the gap kept increasing because Indians themselves were so highly polarized that separatist identities, of which these languages were part, were emphasized and exaggerated to the exclusion of re-conciliation and the shrinking of the middle ground.

During the last days of British rule, the Urdu Hindi debate became more acrimonious. In 1936 in a conference of the Sahitya Sammelan at Nagpur, M.K. Gandhi had defined 'Hindustani' as 'Hindi-Hindustani'. The letters written to Gandhi by the supporters of Urdu—Abdul Haq, Ziauddin Ahmed, etc.—made it clear that by this, the Muslims meant a Sanskritized version of the language (Siddiqi 1998: 206–214). This led to attempts at defining 'Hindustani'.

Among other attempts, a famous series of talks was held on AIR for that purpose. This was the idea of Zulfiqar Bukhari, who declares in his autobiography that he was so much against this Congressite language (Sanskritized Hindustani) that he got the idea of making people give speeches on the radio on Hindustani. For him this was a battle and he concludes that it was Urdu which was the winner (Bukhari 1966: 140).

These talks were held between 20 and 25 February 1939. The speakers were famous figures: Dr Tara Chand, Maulvi Abdul Haq, Babu Rajandra Prasad, Dr Zakir Hussain, Pandit Brij Mohan Datatria Kaifi, and Asif Ali. They had been given two samples, one in Sanskritized Hindi and the other in Persianized Urdu. In the light of these samples, they were supposed to answer the question: 'What is Hindustani? And whether it should be the language to be used on the radio?

The gist of the speeches was that all the speakers rejected Sanskritized Hindi; all of them also rejected the Persianized construction of one phrase (*Fehrist-ē-rāē-dehāndēgān*); i.e. list of those who gave their opinions and all agreed that Hindustani is

the language ordinarily spoken and understood in North India (AIR 1939).

The two samples are as follows:

Sample 1: Sanskritized Hindi
Sunīkut prāntiā viyūsthāpikā prīshad mẽ ēk prashan kā uttar dētē huē niyāē mantrī dāktar kānjū nē un udeyōg dhandô kī sōchī dī jin kī unnatī kē liyē sarkār nē sehāetā dēnā savikār kiyā haē.

Sample 2: Persianized Urdu
Federal legislature *kē liyē Fēhrist-ē-rāē-dehāndēgān tayyār karnē kē silsilē mẽn jō ibtidāī kārvāi kī jāē gī is kē bārē mẽn Sir N. N. Sarkar Law Member nē āj* Assembly *mẽ rōshnī ḍālī.*

The opinions about them are summed up as follows:

	Sample 1	Sample 2
Tara Chand	No specific comment. However, he warns against using unfamiliar words.	No specific comment (20 Feb 1939).
Abdul Haq	'This is not our language. This is an artificially constructed language' (AIR 1939: 31).	Despite the use of some English expressions, this is intelligible (21 Feb 1939).
Rajendra Prasad	This is too Sanskritized (Ibid., 38).	*Rāē-dehāndēgān is* Persian. It should be *rāē dēnē vālē*. It is intelligible (22 Feb 1939) (AIR, 39).
Zakir Hussain	I did not understand it (Ibid., 49).	This is intelligible but *Fehrist- ē-rāē-dehāndegān* should be *'rāe dēnē vālô kī fehrist'* (p. 50) (23 Feb 1939).

	Sample 1	Sample 2
Brij Mohan Datatria Kaifi	A common man will not understand it (Ibid., 64).	*Rāē-dehāndegān* is Persian and is not required. (Ibid., 64) (24 Feb 1939).
Asif Ali	This is artificially constructed (Ibid., 79).	No specific comment but favours simple language (25 Feb 1939).

Bukhari probably got what he was looking for—an unequivocal declaration by both Hindu and Muslim intellectuals that Sanskritized Hindi was less intelligible to most listeners than Persianized Urdu. However, while all speakers agreed that the commonly understood language of North Indian cities was 'Hindustani', Abdul Haq, like Z.A. Bukhari, whose opinion has been quoted earlier in the chapter on 'Names', raised the point that this was a limited language. It could be called Urdu, Hindi or Hindustani but it had to remain confined to lower academic levels and to informal conversation. Literary language is more sophisticated, draws upon sources of vocabulary which, in the case of Urdu come from Persian and Arabic while in the case of Hindi from Sanskrit. What was to be done about these styles? This question was never answered. However, while all speakers agreed not to use Persianized Urdu or Sanskritized Hindi on the radio—the ostensible purpose of the whole exercise—the Hindi-Urdu controversy was so far gone that identity-conscious language use did not decrease on the radio.

ACTION BY THE GOVERNMENT

At last the Government held a conference on 14 February 1945, in which the representatives of the Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu, All-India Hindi Sahitya Sammelan and the Department of Information and Broadcasting met to discuss the language policy of AIR. The main item for discussion was whether there should

be separate Urdu and Hindi broadcasts. After much discussion it was decided not to do this but to adhere to Hindustani of the kind which should be widely intelligible. However, words from other languages—again, only those which were widely understood—could be used if there was no Hindustani word for something (Ahmad 2005: Appendix 1, p. 271).

Yet, according to S.K. Chatterji, words like '*taraqqī* (progress), *mazhab* (religion), *zālim*' (cruel person), etc., which were used in the All India Radio were 'foreign words' and were not understood 'outside of the Uttar Pradesh and the Punjab'. On the other hand, he claimed, 'from Kashmir to Cape Comerin, and from Dibrugarh to Peshawar, 4/5ths of the people who can follow a Radio Talk would understand *unnati*, *dharma*, *atyācārī*, etc (Chatterji 1942: 251). This claim, at least for the areas now in Pakistan, is not true but Chatterji, who believed that the removal of the Sanskritic element shows 'Indian bankruptcy in matters of culture' (1942: 251), was a supporter of the Hindu identity as defined by Sanskrit and Sanskritized Hindi. From him, as from Z.A. Bukhari, no compromise could be expected.

Later, on 26 January 1946, a committee comprising Dr Zakir Hussain and Dr Tarachand among others, discussed the same question again. Once again the Committee concluded 'that the use of Hindustani as the common language for news bulletins though not free from difficulties should not be given up without a further attempt at arriving at a generally acceptable vocabulary' (Ahmad 2005: Appendix II, p. 273). It was pointed out that AIR had compiled a lexicon of about 8,000 English words commonly used in the news along with their Hindi and Urdu equivalents. Suggestions for simple Hindustani synonyms was also given. These, it was decided, would be circulated to experts who would advise the Standing Advisory Body about their suitability. This Body was to have representatives of the Anjuman, the Sammelan and the Hindustani Prachar Sabha (Ibid., 273–274).

RADIO AFTER THE INDEPENDENCE

The British policy after Independence was to direct programmes to both India and Pakistan basically in the same language. As the Head of Eastern services writes to the Commonwealth Relations Office on 17 June 1949.

> This [calling the programme to Pakistan 'Urdu' and India 'Hindi'] should meet the requirements of Nationalists who have wanted an independent service, and will get rid of the increasing anomalies in our language policy at a time when Hindi and Urdu are increasingly separating in idiom. At the same time, we shall keep the language as simple as possible apart from one or two advanced literary programmes, so that probably most of what we put out will be comprehensible in both Dominions (Radio. 1949).

In India and Pakistan, however, the language of broadcasting—especially news, official announcements and religious programmes—diverged increasingly. The story of Sanskritization is documented by Kamal Ahmad Siddiqi and, since the official documents from India are only rarely available to this author, his book has been referred to when quoting from them.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE RADIO IN INDIA

On 27 November 1949, the 'AIR's programme journals substituted the word Hindi for Hindustani. Shortly afterwards separate newscasts started in Urdu' (Chatterji 1987: 47). However, rather surprisingly, Vallabhbhai Patel did not advise extremism in linguistic matters. Writing to R.R. Dawakar, Minister of State, he said in his letter of 14 December 1949:

> If we, as I think we must, accept the criterion of general intelligibility, then obviously the standard of AIR language has to be different from the literary conceptions of orthodox Hindi. AIR is not, and should never be, a literary club (Quoted from Siddiqi 1998: 282).

He does not call Urdu the same as easy Hindi but concedes that it should be used on AIR. Patel also objected to the use of Sanskritic terms for the Constituent Assembly, Security Council, etc. Moreover, he again emphasized that the news should be in Hindustani not in Hindi (Note of 8 April 1948 quoted from Siddiqi 1998: 285). However, the language of AIR was Sanskritized to the extent that the Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, complained that he could not understand the language in which his Hindi speeches were reported in the news bulletins. This happened as the trend towards Sanskritization increased, when Dr Keskar became the Minister for Information and Broadcasting. In any case there were two news bulletins from 18 December 1949 and both become symbols of identity so efforts to make them diverge from each other continued (Quoted from Siddiqi 1998: 293).

When Gopal Reddi became the Minister of Information and Broadcasting in 1962, he tried to make the language of the Urdu and Hindi bulletins the same (Ibid., 295). Some members of parliament from UP and Bihar, the two states which boasted the largest Urdu-speaking communities in India as well as maximum religious polarization, got together to raise the slogan 'Hindi in danger'. Dr Reddi was criticized and, though he defended himself, the Congress could not afford to lose its support in the populous Hindi-belt and it was decided that 'nothing should be done to militate against the genius of Hindi' (*Hindustan Times*, 6 August 1962. Quoted from Siddiqi 1998: 296).

During the Emergency, the intelligence agencies reported that people follow Urdu programmes better than Hindi ones (Ibid., 301). On 3 September 1976, the Ministry of Broadcasting held a meeting regarding the Urdu services of AIR and Doordarshan Kendra, Amritsar. In this it was decided that the Urdu service was popular in Pakistan as well as India. It was also decided that the Urdu used should be simple. One recommendation is:

—the aim should be to bring the spoken Hindi and Urdu as near to each other as possible so that inter-changeability of words may become possible—An experiment may also be made in some programmes of AIR, where alternative words from Hindi and Urdu may be used (three-page report dated 21 Sept 1976 in Siddiqi 1998: 307).

However, despite these resolutions, language remained a political issue. When Urdu news bulletins were separated from Hindi in India, the tendency of finding difficult words—borrowed as always from Persian and Arabic roots in the case of Urdu and Sanskrit in Hindi—increased.

Siddiqi analyses these trends in chapter 5 of his book. On the one hand there was criticism from the Urdu lobby for using easily understood words like '*Baṛā Wazīr*'—the lobby wanted '*Wazīr-ē-'ālā*' (The Chief Minister) which is Persianized whereas '*baṛ ā*' is 'big' in ordinary Urdu-Hindi (Siddiqui 1998: 345). But on the other, there was also criticism of borrowings from Sanskrit. Meanwhile, the Sanskritist lobby, with official backing, insisted on more Sanskritization of Hindi even if Urdu was to be left alone being a minority preserve.

Till date, the situation both on the radio and the TV is that the news bulletins and other official programmes are in Sanskritized Hindi, while entertainment is in popular Hindi-Urdu. Songs, for instance, are in this highly intelligible language and are, therefore, popular in Pakistan as well as India. In short, while the Sanskritized language serves to mark identity and define the parameters of the in-group and the out-group (in this case the 'other' being both Muslim and Pakistani), the street-credible language carries the soft image of India all over the world.

LANGUAGE OF THE RADIO IN PAKISTAN

Zulfikar Bukhari, whom we have met earlier, was the first Director General of Radio Pakistan and he insisted on Persianized Urdu. Hameed Naseem, who served under him in the radio and then achieved high rank in the broadcasting world, was educated in the same classical literary tradition. His autobiography—like that of Bukhari himself which we have referred to earlier—*Nāmumkin kī Justujū* (1990), is full of Persian couplets, and Persian lines are interspersed in it as if everyone would understand them as a matter of course. The two criteria of linguistic sophistication he uses are Persianization and correctness of pronunciation. He laments that Persian is no longer patronized in Pakistan and that this is tantamount to abandoning one's tradition (Naseem 1990: 227). As for pronunciation, the criterion of correctness is not the usage of ordinary speakers of Urdu. Instead, it is the classical language from which the word is derived. For instance, the ordinary pronunciation of '*ātish*' (fire) is corrected to '*ātash*' in the Peshawar Radio Station (Ibid., 210); the poet Rais Amrohvi points out to Naseem that the pronunciation of miracle is '*karashmā*' and not '*karishmā*' as used by ordinary people. However, Naseem refutes this through his knowledge of the classics of Urdu. However, pronunciation was only the outward manifestation of the language ideology which placed Persian at a higher pedestal in the hierarchy of languages than the indigenous languages and word-stocks of the subcontinent. These concepts of language ideology, reinforced with ideologies of national identity, went into the language policies and practices of the radio and TV in Pakistan.

During the early years of Pakistan there were attempts to change, or Islamize, the classical music which had words like Ram, Krishna, *gōpī* (female cowherd), etc. The singers were generally resisting this attempt at ideologically-inspired language-planning. Thus, when a Muslim League leader, Mian Abdul Bari, expressed the necessity of such changes in a meeting,

a wit remarked that the following line could be Islamized as
follows:

> *Mōri baiyyã na marōṛ Krishnā Marārī*
> to
> *Mōri baiyyã na marōṛ Miã Abdul Bārī*

'*Mōri bayyã na marōṛ*' [Do not twist my arm] remains the same but
the Hindu name of (Krishna Marari) has been replaced by a
Muslim one—that of the leader (Qureshi 1987: 155). Changes of
this kind were also reported by Sheema Kermani, the famous
classical dancer, who wrote to the author in an e-mail letter that
'Bade Ghulam Ali Khan, the famous singer who had migrated to
Pakistan in 1947, actually went back to India when he was told
by the Director of Radio Pakistan that he may not use words like
"kanhaiya" and "Krishna" and "Shyam", etc. in his thumris and
dadras' (Kermani 2009).

Indeed, not only was Urdu purged of the few remaining Hindi
elements in Pakistan, but it was even purged of some traditional
Persian usages. During the height of General Ziaul Haq's
Islamization drive, even the traditional greeting *Khudā Hāfiz* was
changed to '*Allāh Hāfiz*. Both mean 'God Preserve You from
harm' but *Khudā* is the Persian word for God whereas Islamic
purism required the Arabic equivalent. The political vocabulary
borrows extensively and self-consciously from Arabic and
Persian rather than the indigenous tradition. Thus, words like
'*chunāō*' (election), '*rāj*' (rule), common between Urdu and Hindi,
are studiously avoided and their Perso-Arabic equivalents
'*intikhābāt*' and '*hukūmat*' are used.

Aslam Azhar, who was head of Pakistan Television for five
years (1972–1977), told the present author that TV also had the
same policy as the radio. The news was in formal and Persianized
Urdu while the entertainment features were in ordinary,
intelligible language. As for changes like '*Allāh Hāfiz*' from '*Khudā
Hāfiz*' they came in without written instructions during the Ziaul

Haq years. If there were any written instructions he is not aware of them (Azhar Int. 2006).

This is also confirmed, among others, by Ashfaq Ahmad Gondal, Federal Secretary in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting till 2009, and Director General of the Radio Pakistan in 2006–2007. In his official position as Secretary he was also the Chairman of the PTV. He said that orders and instructions about such changes as '_Khudā Hāfiz_' to '_Allāh Hāfiz_' were issued during meetings of media chiefs. He was not present at the meeting when this occurred but he knew definitely that it was during the period of General Ziaul Haq (Gondal Int. 2009).

One effect of the 1965 War was that it increased anxiety about nationalism and national identity. Thus the share of English was reduced and that of Urdu, seen as the carrier of Pakistani nationalism, increased. After the 1971 War, the anxiety increased even further and so did the emphasis on Urdu. Now English came to be restricted to the morning and evening news and, after Urdu, the share of the indigenous languages of Pakistan also increased (Qureshi 1987: 75).

Famous figures from the radio such as Agha Nasir and Iftikhar Arif, mention a purist policy about pronunciation on Radio Pakistan. Agha Nasir said that there used to be a 'pronunciation checker' and the criterion was the Urdu of Lucknow and Delhi. Some words of Bengali such as '_Purbhō_' (West) were added for political reasons but otherwise the attitude was very purist (Nasir Int. 2006). Iftikhar Arif also told the author that there was a person responsible for ensuring that the pronunciation would not deviate from the norms set up in Delhi and Lucknow. It was assumed that this was the best pronunciation and even Punjabi speakers would try to conform to it. He himself pronounced the word 'hope' as '_umēd_' whereas ordinary speakers of Urdu pronounce it as '_ummīd_' but, when asked to explain this aberration, defended himself with reference to a Persian couplet in which the prosody required this pronunciation rather than

the one used ordinarily and, further, said that he was from Lucknow and what he spoke was correct. This was his stand even after more than half a century when he was giving this interview in 2009 (Arif Int. 2009). So much was the obsession with the UP pronunciation of Urdu that some people could flout all norms of politeness if some pronunciation of Urdu was not considered 'correct by them. For instance an experienced figure from Radio Pakistan tells us that the poet Josh kept correcting the interviewer's Urdu pronunciation (Qureshi 1987: 169–170).

This policy continues even today though, according to a former head of both the radio and the TV, 'it is not practical and the experts became redundant' in time (Gondal. Int 2009). However, Mr Gondal also pointed out that he had himself corrected '*gullī dandā*' to '*gillī dandā*' (Ibid., 2009).

Radio Pakistan and the television channels are the main purveyors of Urdu in the country. According to the data of 2010, the total time given to all radio broadcasts per day is 305 minutes and the total number of broadcasts is 61. Out of the 18 languages used for broadcasting within the country, the number of minutes given to Urdu are 115 (PBC information, May 2010). As for television, besides Pakistan TV with its three channels all functioning mostly in Urdu, licenses have been issued to eighty-two TV channels, out of which ten are not functioning and thirteen are in the indigenous languages of the country. Three channels function in mixed languages (two in Urdu and English and one in Urdu and Punjabi) leaving the rest of the fifty-six channels operating in Urdu (PEMRA 2010).

In short, radio and the TV spread the spoken language common to India and Pakistan known respectively as Hindi and Urdu in the two countries in the entertainment programmes. However, in both media, especially in state-sponsored programmes, the Hindi-Urdu controversy goes on till this day. Ideological—both nationalistic and religious—programmes in India evoke identity-consciousness among Hindu audiences by

using Sanskritic words and religious symbols. In Pakistan the same is done by using Persian and Arabic words and Islamic allusions. Indeed, the fear of not being considered separate enough from India has tabooed commonly understood words of Hindi which were used for centuries in the ancestor of Urdu but now cause such anxiety that they are never used on the air or on the screen in Pakistan. And in India, similar antagonisms and anxieties still keep increasing the distance between the official registers of Urdu and Hindi. Meanwhile, Urdu-Hindi continues to rule the short waves and, as we will see in the next chapter, the screen as far as entertainment is concerned.

14

Urdu on the Screen

This chapter complements the previous chapter in so far as it aims at enhancing our understanding of how Urdu was used in the new media which came into South Asia in the wake of modernity. The major emphasis is on the cinema. Since television combines the features of both radio and cinema, some of the policies governing the use of language in it derive from the one or the other, as the case may be. Thus, what is true for radio and cinema, is also relevant for TV. Let us, then, begin with cinema.

The precursor of the cinema was the theatre. Although it is asserted that after 1550 the Portuguese performed their plays in Hindustani (Nami 1962–1973, Vol. 3: 86), this did not create a clear, unbroken tradition leading to the Parsi theatre of the nineteenth century of which Urdu became the major language, and which is the precursor of Bollywood (Suvorova 2009: 16). But the Parsi theatre, in turn, drew upon various folk traditions such as *Nautankī,* the *Rām Līlā* and *Raslīlā* plays. According to Kathryn Hansen, 'The Nautanki theatre of North India is linguistically identified by its use of Hindi and Urdu' though other languages—such as Braj, Awadhi, Bhojpuri, etc.—may be used (Hansen 1992: 36–37). The *Rām Līlā* was 'Hindi devotional drama' (Hansen 1992: 66–62) while the *Raslīla* was 'dance drama based on the episodes from the life of Krishna' (Suvorova 2009: 29). All of them carried some dialect of Hindi, including Hindustani, to many spectators in North India.

A real boost to Urdu came from the emergence of courtly theatre in Lucknow. This happened when Wajid Ali Shah (r. 1847–56), the ruler of Awadh, patronized '*Indarsabhā*', a musical drama in Urdu written by a poet called Syed Agha Hasan Amanat (1815–1859). The play was probably written in 1851 and staged in Lucknow in 1852. It is in the Urdu romantic, poetical tradition—complete with fairies, princes, magic spells and so on—but also draws upon the European dramatic tradition (Taj 2007).

The play became popular and was reproduced all over India (Suvorova 2009: 37–48). In time, all plays in this magical, romantic tradition came to be known as *sabhās*. And, being in some variant of Hindustani, they spread knowledge of this language in the small towns of North India (Sharar 1927: 194). Moreover, as Hansen points out, this also made Indo-Muslim manners part of the North Indian theatre (Hansen 1992: 79–80).

The Parsi theatre accepted these existing traditions but, initially, the language of this theatre was Gujarati. The transition to Urdu came soon. According to Kathryn Hansen this happened as follows:

> By the 1870s the large companies had adopted the practice of hiring Muslim *munshis* (Scribes) as part of their permanent staff, and Urdu became the principal language of the stage. Zarif and Rounaq were prolific authors who worked for the Original Theatrical Company of Bombay in the 1870s and 1880s (Hansen 1992: 81).

However, a Hindustani version (mixed with Gujarati and Marathi) of 'Raja Gopalchandra', written and directed by Vishnudas Bhave, was produced as early as 1853 (Hansen 1992: 82). By the 1870s, companies 'performing in Urdu toured the subcontinent eventually becoming popular all over India and abroad' (Suvorova 2009: 74). Thus, mostly because of business imperatives, Urdu became the major language of the Parsi theatre.

But this was not necessarily the polished language of Delhi and Lucknow. As Mirza Mohammad Hadi Rusva, the novelist, found to his dismay. While much gratified by the pretty faces of the actors, their good acting and general demeanour he was appalled by their commonplace idiom and accent. They spoke, as he sadly commented, the idiom of Bombay's 'fish market' (*machlī bāzār*) (Rusva 1928: 5).

However, precisely because it was not the artificially Persianized idiom of Lucknow and Delhi's elite, the language spread all over British India. In a sense, as Qurratul Ain Hyder points out, the Parsi theatre—and later Bollywood—was a living symbol of the composite culture of Hindus and Muslims of which ordinary, spoken Urdu. Hindi is the obvious medium. As she remarks:

> In the Parsi theatre they used to sing Urdu ghazals as in "Harischandra" "Nal and Damayanti", or "Chandravati", and at the same time perform *bhajans*, Hindvi hymns, as in "Rustum and Sohrab" or "Shirin and Farhad" (Hyder 1976: 18).

Out of numerous examples, one from '*Indar Sabhā*' itself will suffice. This is a holi in Braj Bhasha.

> *Lāj rakh lē shiām hamārī*
> *Maĩ chīrī hũ tumhārī*
> Preserve my modesty my Shiam
> I'm your disciple (Translation by Taj 2007: 135–136).

These characteristics of the Indar Sabha and the Parsi theatre influenced the development of the film industry in India.

SILENT FILMS

The Indian cinema began with silent movies in 1912. In these films, captions were used. Bombay emerged as the seat of the film industry in India. Although Gujarati and Marathi were the

indigenous languages of most of the Bombay Presidency, Hindi was not unknown. The *Report of the Indian Cinematograph Committee 1927–28* says that the main vernaculars are: 'Hindi, Urdu, Bengali, Gujarati, Marathi, Tamil, and Telugu' (Cinema 1928: 41). The solution was to dub the films in the regional language as some witnesses suggested (Cinema Evidence, Vol. IV: 78). However, the hall managers printed pamphlets and in some places people read out the captions loudly for the benefit of the illiterate. For much of North India the preferred language for this was Hindi—or Hindustani as it was sometimes called—though sometimes the Perso-Arabic script was used. A proprietor, Irani, questioned about the language difficulty said:

> In most cases we put in different languages in the same films. For upper India we put Urdu and so on... (Cinema Evidence, Vol. 1: 167).

This script was, however, associated with the Muslim identity in the minds of the producers, members of the Committee as well as, one presumes, the general public. For instance, when N.E. Navle was asked in Gujarat whether they used Urdu captions for the Muslims, he did point out that the Muslims understood Marathi but also conceded that the use of these captions 'would certainly be a good addition' (Cinema Evidence, Vol. IV 1928: 298).

The members of the committee assumed that 'Hindi'—spoken Hindustani—was generally well-known and that Bombay pictures were popular even in Madras (Cinema 1928, Vol. 1: 12), but, in fact, the dissemination of spoken Hindustani must have been an ongoing process with the films playing a key role in it. That is why the silent movies used more languages than the talkies did.

The way out of the linguistic morass was to superimpose one language. Ardeshir Bilimoria, Director, Madan Theatres, Bombay, said this language could be English but the Chairman of the

Committee replied: 'Make everybody learn Hindi' (Cinema Evidence, Vol. 1: 347).

As films were a means of reaching the public, the state also used them for its own purposes. A note entitled 'Films for publicity' of 1939–40 states:

> We wish to reach the 1000-odd cinemas which show mainly or exclusively Indian films (Films 1940).

These films are mostly in English or Hindustani, though some are in Bengali, Tamil, Marathi, and Telugu, in addition to these two languages (Films 1940). Some films were shown to inspire villagers to join the army. In one letter about such films an officer says:

> Language is not a matter of great importance as we always send a demonstrator with our cinemas who keeps up a running patter with the help of loud speakers (Films 1939).

In the Punjab, where most of the army came from, this 'patter' might have been in Punjabi though Punjabi soldiers understood spoken Hindustani very well. Indeed, in the evidence on the Punjab, it was observed that the captions should be in Urdu and English (Cinema Evidence, Vol. 1: 91). This was because Urdu was taught in the schools and used in the lower domains of power in the Punjab. Even in areas where there was no such official role of the language, the Bombay films were understood. As an observer noticed:

> Films made in Bombay, in what is known as film Hindustani, often have an enormous success with audiences who, again cannot understand one word of them (Shaw 1942).

However, Hindustani was considered the common language to such an extent that the educational films were supposed to be in it. The Deputy Educational Inspector, Visual Instruction, Bombay

said that even foreign films for educational purposes 'should have Hindi or Hindustani titles whenever they are shown' (Cinema Evidence, Vol. 1: 30).

TALKIES

The era of the silent movies passed when the first 'talkie' '*Ālam Ārā*' was made by Irani on 14 March 1931. The number of talkies produced between 1931 and 1995 is as follows:

1931–1978	13,482
1979–1985	5,426
1986–1995	9,500
Total	28,408
Source: Statistics compiled by Suresh Chandvankar as quoted in Da. Ranade 2006: 18).	

Apart from the dialogues, the songs in these films were an important linguistic input. These songs, often written by Muslim poets, were in Urdu (Gulzar 2003: 279–294). If the number of songs is eight per film and the ratio of Hindi to regional-language films is 1:2.5 then there were about 25,000 Hindi songs in circulation (Da. Ranade 2006: 18).

According to Amita Malik:

> Film songs as well as Urdu poetry became a subtle form of counter propaganda in All India Radio's Urdu Service. The natural amalgam of Hindi and Urdu, what is popularly known as Hindustani, in the language of Bombay films, led to the evolution of the nearest India has got to a national language (Malik 2003: 63).

After partition, Hindi movies began to grow in size. One learns from the *Report of the Film Enquiry Committee* (1951), that the educational films were dubbed 'particularly [in] Hindi' (Film

Committee 1951: 56). The production of feature films in 1948 were as follows:

Hindi	147
Gujarati	28
Marathi	7
Tamil	33
Telugu	7
Bengali	37
Punjabi	–
Other	6
Total	264

(Source: Film Committee 1951: 322).

During the 1950s, Hindi films were being shown in 1,858 cinemas whereas the Tamil ones, which were runners up, were shown in 674 cinemas. The other numbers are: Telugu (324); Bengali (255) and English (108) (Ibid., 130). Hindi films, especially the songs, are enjoyed much beyond the Hindi belt in India.

Indeed, Hindi films are watched in 130 countries; every third person watches or is eager to watch Hindi films (Gulzar and Chatterjee 2003: 153). The number of films censored in 2000 shows the popularity of Hindi films:

Films censored in India 1990–2000

Hindi	243
Urdu	0

Out of a total of 835 films in 39 languages, most films are in the Hindi language. Telugu films were 204 in 1990 but in 2000 they were 143. The number of films formally classified as 'Urdu' are only seven in these ten years (Gulzar and Chatterjee 2003: 154), but everyone in Pakistan understands the 'Hindi' films from India. Indeed, India is the top movie-producing country among a list of ten such countries in figures of four decades from 1974

to 2004 (Thussu 2009: 99). Thus, the claim that Bollywood, as well as Indian TV, have been globalized, has substance (Kumar 2009; Thussu 2009: 101).

Besides India, these films and their songs are popular in Pakistan, Nepal and whenever people from these countries, as well as India, are living.

THE LANGUAGE OF BOLLYWOOD

While images draw the most attention of the viewer, 'the function of language in cinema is multifaceted, dispelling the widely held notion that language is of secondary importance in the cinematic experience' (Dissanayake 2008: 395). However, this 'language' is a combination of registers, varieties and even different languages which vary according to characters, themes, places and time.

The point is that there is a unified world of discourse which is constituted by a plurality of languages, registers, varieties, and sociolects which are imbricated with values and associated with different ways of existence. All these are conjured up to create an atmosphere in the film in which there are lines of English, words of Sanskrit in the temple and those of Persian in a Nawab's story about Lucknow. Urdu words loaded with medieval (Muslim) cultural references are not only found in Hindi films but 'are "de rigeur" in Indian and Sinhalese popular films' (Dissanayake 2008: 399).

Some people have commented that the language of Bollywood, although called Hindi, is actually Urdu. Agha Nasir, among others, said the same thing in an interview with the present author (Nasir Int. 2006). Historians of the cinema have pointed out that beginning with the early success of 'Ālam Ārā', Urdu started dominating the cinema. This is also acknowledged by Suniti Kumar Chatterji who, being a supporter of Sanskritization, condemns 'cinema Hindusthani—in films made in Bombay and elsewhere. The titles of these films are mostly in Persian...' and

he goes on to comment sarcastically at words like *mohabbat* (love) and *zindagi* (life) for being used in these films (Chatterji 1942: 257). That there is clear evidence of Urdu being learned by workers of the film industry in Mumbai is beyond dispute. Let us look only at some of this evidence. In her conversation with Nasreen Munni Kabir, Lata describes her experience of learning Urdu as follows one day:

> LM: I must tell you the story. One day Anil Biswas, Yusuf Bhai [Dilip Kumar] and I were travelling to work together on the train. This was in 1947 or '48. In those days, Yusuf Bhai was able to travel by train as no one really recognized him!
>
>   We were sitting in a compartment and Yusuf Bhai asked who I was. Anilda replied: 'She is a new singer and sings well. You'll like her voice when you hear her'. They were chatting together and Yusuf Bhai asked him: 'Where is she from?' 'She is Maharashtrian'. 'But their Urdu pronunciation isn't correct and in their singing you can smell *daal-bhaat*' [implying a Marathi accent would come through in the pronunciation of Urdu]. I felt terribly hurt hearing him say such a thing.
>
>   I knew the composer Mohammed Shafi. He was an assistant to Anil Biswas and Naushad Sahib, and a few days later, I told him I wanted to learn Urdu so I could pronounce it correctly. He found me a *maulana*, a man called Mehboob, who taught me Urdu for a short while. When I speak, my Urdu isn't very good, but when I sing I make sure there are no flaws in my diction (Kabir 2009: 67).

A famous song of hers, given to her by Naushad, a famous composer when Lata was at the beginning of her career, was supposed to be sung on stage by Nargis, famous as an actress at that time, in Mehboob Khan's film *Andāz*. Mehboob Khan had reservations about Lata's singing. He expressed them to Naushad as follows: 'Naushad Sahab, I'm sure you know what you are doing, but you do realize that the very first song is a ghazal, needing impeccable Urdu enunciation, while your singer is a

Maharashtrian!' (Ibid., 46). Naushad, however, trusted Lata and the song became famous.

Even films in languages other than Hindi sometimes had Hindi songs. For instance, Lata's first song, in 1944, was sung in the Marathi film *Gajabhau* (Terrible Happening) (Bhimani 1995: 91). But Hindi was so pervasive an influence that Lata's grandmother would sing to her a folk song with a blend of Marathi and Hindi.

While Lata's case was of several decades back, even the young actor, Hrithik Roshan (b. 1974), 'attended dance classes and learnt Urdu' when he decided to become an actor (Ghosh 2004: 32). Shah Rukh Khan (b. 1965) was brought up by a father who 'could recite lengthy Urdu verses' and a mother who spoke Hyderabadi Urdu (Chopra 2007: 25). Even now, as the present author found in his visit to Mumbai in March 2007, a number of actors and actresses hire experts in Urdu to correct their pronunciation. This information on the language of script writers, directors, editors, and actors of both films and television soap operas was gathered through face-to-face as well as telephonic interviews.

The persons interviewed were Javed Akhtar, Javed Siddiqui, Gulzar, Nadira Zaheer, Ghazala Nargis, Paresh Kamdar and Gauri Patwardhan. The first three are famous script writers for film. Nadira Zaheer, daughter of Sajjad Zaheer and wife of Raj Babbar, writes plays for the theatre. Ghazala Nargis, daughter of the famous Urdu scholar Shams ur Rahman Faruqi and wife of Paresh Kamdar a film-maker, writes dialogues for TV plays. Gauri Patwardhan is an editor of films and works in the Film and Television Institute of India.

To the question as to what was the language of films and TV plays, they generally gave the answer: 'Hindustani'. Javed Akhtar said it was 'Hindustani inclining to the Urdu end of the language' (Akhtar Int. 2007). Gauri Patwardhan said they merely avoided difficult Persian and Sanskrit words (Patwardhan Int. 2007).

Other interviewees, upon probing, also said the language was close to Urdu. Nadira Zaheer said the languages of some plays, for instance Agha Hashar's '*Yahūdī kī Laṛkī*' (Daughter of the Jew) was Urdu (Zaheer Int. 2007). Gulzar said: 'It is called Hindustani as well as Hindi. You may call it Urdu in Pakistan. It is basically the same language' (Gulzar Int. 2007). Javed Siddiqui, however, pointed out that the character, the situation, as well as the ambience of the film determines the choice of the language. It can range from some dialect to Bumbaiya Hindi to Sanskritized Hindi or Urdu (Siddiqui Int. 2007).

Paresh Kamdar said that the actors and actresses hire teachers to correct their pronunciation. He narrated how a certain Maulana Sahib was hired in one of his own films in order to teach the pronunciation of Urdu (Kamdar Int. 2007). In most cases the script is written in English. The dialogue is written in Hindustani but in the Devanagari script. Then the actors/actresses read the dialogue and are corrected by colleagues or professionals. Ghazala Nargis said TV soap operas used comprehensible language but the role did influence the choice of language and style (Ghazala Int. 2007).

Not only the script writers but even munshis are reported to be employed by aspiring actors and actresses to polish their Urdu accent. Of course they call it '*shudh* Hindi' but it is, nevertheless, not the Sanskritized Hindi which politicians and officials have to learn. It is the kind of 'Hindi' which visitors from Pakistan are often congratulated on speaking in Indian cities. In sort it has linguistic capital at least in some circles of Indian society despite the official use of modern Sanskritized Hindi.

In short, it would appear that the social capital of Urdu, created by Islamizing it and indexing it to a Muslim, urban, sophisticated, elitist identity in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, survives at some level in North Indian society. Thus, Urdu writers' works—such as ghazal and *rubāī*—appear as songs (*gīt*) in films (Khan 2006: 321). Also:

Famous singers such as Mukesh, Kishore, Rafi, Lata, Asha Bhosle, and Geeta Dutt did, and still do, reproduce flawless Urdu-Arabic sounds: *z* not *j*, *sh* not as *s*, *q* not as *k*, and *gh* (ghein) not as *g*, etc. the only exceptions being singers from Punjab, likes of Rafi, and Punjabi poets also substitute *k* (Koran) for *q* (Quran) (Khan 2006: 321).

The prevalence of Urdu is also explained with reference to the presence of Muslim workers and artists in the industry.

For instance, a book which discusses the language of films is Ali Husain Mir and Raza Mir's *Anthems of Resistance* (2006). Two chapters in this book (6 and 7) consider the role of the progressive movement in the songs of films (pp. 111–134 and pp. 135–171). The book is about the progressive movement in Urdu literature which began in 1934 in London and was formally established as the All India Progressive Writers Association (PWA) in India. This was a left-leaning movement and some of its major poets joined the film industry. The connection with Bollywood started then.

The progressive writers also wrote songs for the cinema. The Indian People's Theatre Association (IPTA) and the cultural wing of the Communist Party of India tried to inspire the masses through songs. Probably the greatest progressive to enter the film industry was Sahir Ludhianvi who made his debut in 1941 in *Naujawān* (Young Man). Majrooh Sultanpuri and Kaifi Azmi were also among the pioneers. Later they were joined by Ali Sardar Jafri, Jan Nisar Akhtar, Neeraj, Gulzar, and Javed Akhtar. But it is not a question of merely Muslim identity—only eleven out of forty-one composers of music for Indian films between 1931 and 1947 were Muslims (Da. Ranade 2006: 147–148)—the real point is the culture of the film industry which uses a language of wide intelligibility which happens to be nearer to spoken Urdu than to Sanskritized Hindi. So one does not have to be Talat Mahmood (1924–1998) from Lucknow with his 'flawless and sophisticated pronunciation of Urdu' (Da. Ranade 2006: 391), but anyone—Muslim or Hindu; Punjabi or Bengali—who is ready to learn Urdu and sing or act in it. Sahir's work is very popular both

as lyrics of films and in the written form. His poem '*chaklē*' (Brothels) was sung in the film *Piyāsā* (Thirsty) (1957). Some difficult Persian words and constructions were removed but the rest of it remained the same.

Gradually the serious theme of social awareness and revolution favoured by the progressives were squeezed out of the cinema. The alternative cinema distanced itself from the light-hearted romance and melodrama of mainstream Bollywood but, at the same time, this cinema 'sought to distance itself from the *bazaar*, Hindustani of commercial films, the alternate film-makers adopted a self-consciously Sanskritized Hindi, as is evident even from the titles of the films of Shyam Benegal, Gaina Nihalani and others: *Ankur* (Seedling), *Nishānt* (Night's End), *Manthan* (Churning); *Bhūmika* (Actor), *Ākrōsh* (Anguish), *Ardhasatyā* (Half-truth) (Mir and Mir 2006: 127–128).

But whatever the history of the language practices of Bollywood, what needs explanation is the fact that even after sixty-two years of independence and enthusiastic Indian nationalism—even Hindu chauvinism around Mumbai itself—the language of Bollywood is so close to Urdu. This is, after all, a matter of conscious choice and a number of scholars have discussed it.

One of them, Mukul Kesavan, argues that the roots of the Hindi cinema are in the Islamicate culture of feudal, decadent, aristocratic Muslim centres of rule of which Lucknow is the best known archetype. The language of this culture, he argues, is Urdu. Thus, 'Urdu, Awadh and the *tawaif* [courtesan] have been instrumental in shaping Hindi cinema as a whole—not just some "Muslim" component of it' (Kesavan 1994: 255).

Other scholars have contested this. Among them is Harish Trivedi who has pointed out that not all Hindi films are in the same language. They do use different styles of speaking. Some of them use Sanskritized Hindi in titles, in dialogues and even in lyrics. Indeed, they use the language most appropriate for the

occasion (register) and the person (idiolect or dialect). Thus, different characters draw upon different symbolic vocabularies— Muslims on Perso-Arabic ones in historical films and Hindus on Sanskritic ones—for distinctive authenticity. Moreover the argot of the Mumbai underworld—'Bambaiya Hindi'—is also used in some films as are dialects such as Bhojpuri. In short, only the language corresponding to 'Urdu', to the exclusion of other styles and varieties of the larger composite language Hindi-Urdu, are not used in 'Hindi' films (Trivedi 2006).

However, while the languages of Bollywood's 'Hindi' movies is not always the language called 'Urdu' in Pakistan's films, it is also true that it is not the Sanskritized Hindi of India's officialdom. Thus, though Kesavan states that he is not 'trying to claim that Urdu became the language of cinema because it approximated more closely to "natural" speech as opposed to a more confected, more "synthetic" Hindi' (Kesavan 1994: 249), that is precisely the implication of his work and the argument being presented here. Indeed, this language is closer to what used to be called 'Hindustani'. In its commonly used form, it is almost identical to what Pakistanis call Urdu. The few words which differ in Pakistani and Indian films are as follows:

Word	Bollywood	Lollywood
Trust	*Vishwās/yaqīn*	*Yaqīn*
Family	*Parīwār/khāndān*	*Khāndān*
Love	*Prēm/piyār/mohabbat/ishq/*love	*Piyār/mohabbat/ishq/*love
Worry	*Chintā/fikar*	*Fikr*
Country	*Dēsh/watan/mulk*	*Dēs/watan/mulk*
Alcohol	*Dārū/sharāb*	*Sharāb*

These words are well known, however, to film audiences on both sides of the border. In general, notwithstanding some difficult Perso-Arabic words in Lollywood Urdu or Sanskritic ones in

Bollywood Hindi, the language in general use is similar enough to be widely understood by audiences on both sides of the border. Thus those who celebrate the entertainment industry in South Asia: films, dramas, songs, and jokes, etc., as the common linguistic legacy of both Pakistan and India have a point. After all, the language has been called by other names before as we have seen. But it is only the entertainment industry which uses this language, though like everybody else, it calls it either Hindi or Urdu. It should be called 'Urdu-Hindi' but that would not sound politically correct to either the Indian or the Pakistani official establishments.

As mentioned in the last paragraph, my hypothesis is that the language of Bollywood dips towards the Urdu end, as does that of the soap operas on the TV and the street itself, because this is the natural language of North Indian and Pakistani cities. It is popular because it is intelligible to more people than any other South Asian language and, therefore, it sells better than any other language. The sellers of entertainment are aware of this and hence, wisely, they do not get ensnared by ideology into using Sanskritized Hindi. Likewise, they do not use highly Persianized Urdu either. Sahir Ludhianwi's line 'sanã k̲h̲uān-ē-taqdīs-ē-Mashriq khã haẽ... [those who praise the sacredness of the East, where are they?]' was changed to the following line in ordinary Urdu-Hindi (jinhẽ nāz haē Hind par vō Kahã haẽ=where are those who are proud of India....) when it was sung. After all, how many people on the streets of South Asia, even in the northern side of it, understand Persian and the line is in Persian except the last two words of it. As it happens, the ordinary Urdu spoken in Pakistani cities is very much like the ordinary Hindi spoken in Indian cities. That is why the language of Bollywood is so close to the language of Lollywood.

Indian supporters of Urdu sometimes regard it as a grievance that the censor boards should issue certificates of Hindi rather than Urdu to films produced by Bollywood. But whether called

Urdu, Hindi or Hindustani, the cinema from Mumbai has served both Urdu and Hindi very well and has taken these languages to the people of South Asia and all over the world. Films have taught Urdu-Hindi to areas speaking different languages such as the South of India, Bengal, Punjab, and Pakistan. They are watched in the Gulf states and even in Kabul, although the Taliban almost wiped them out. They are even watched in the West, especially by the South Asian diaspora, with English sub-titles. The language came to be dispersed more widely in the 1960s through them. But, of course, this language is neither indexed to the Hindu nor to the Muslim (communal) identities.

And that is precisely why officialdom, chauvinists and extremists on both sides want to deny the similarity of the commonly understood street language in North India and Pakistan and that this language—call it what you will—is closer to spoken Urdu in Pakistan than they wish to acknowledge.

LANGUAGE OF THE TELEVISION

The television performs the functions of both the radio and the cinema. The former functions include carrying out official propaganda. The latter functions focus on entertainment though films are also the vehicles of officially endorsed points of view. In general, the language of the officially endorsed programmes in both Pakistan and India is the formal, artificially constructed and difficult to understand (if not unintelligible) Persianized Urdu and Sanskritized Hindi, respectively. The language of the entertainment programmes, the dramas of Pakistan and the soap operas of India, is the widely intelligible language common between Pakistan and India.

However, this language does vary from character to character, situation to situation and atmosphere to atmosphere. In the Pakistani play '*Wāris*' (heir), for instance, the Chaudhary Sahib speaks in a Punjabi accent and even puts in a few Punjabi words here and there to create the flavour of authenticity. Maulvis use

more Arabic terms than ordinary people and young, educated
people use many English words.

In the Indian soap opera from Star Plus '*Bidāī*', Mr Sharma uses
more Sanskritized Hindi than the other characters. In '*Yē Rishtā
Kyā Kaehlātā Haē*' (what is this relationship called?), also from
Star Plus, '*Dadda Ji*' and '*Shankari Tai*' speak in the local dialect
not in ordinary standardized Khari Boli Hindi. And, of course, all
characters use '*chintā*', '*vishvās*' and '*shānt*' (peaceful) which are
never used in the television programmes from Pakistan.

In short, there are certain ingrained assumptions of language
usage in both countries. In India, as there are many Muslims, the
uses of words associated with them are not tabooed. In Pakistan,
however, words like '*chintā*', being associated with Hindi and the
Hindu identity, are beyond limits. The language policies and
practices of the radio and the TV of Pakistan were not available
in the form of documents to this author. However, the
biographies and interviews of important people associated with
these institution shed some light upon them.

THE LANGUAGE OF LOLLYWOOD

Lahore was an important centre of the film industry in the areas
now in Pakistan before the Partition. G.K. Mehta with Abdur
Rashid Kardar released '*Husn kā Dākū*' (The docoit of beauty) in
1929–30 at Lahore's Bhati Gate. Muhammad Ismail made posters
for the film. In 1920, they set up United Players Corporation at
Ravi Road. '*Hīr Rānjhā*' was the first sound film produced in
Lahore at the United Player's Studio.

Soon after partition, many people connected with the film
industry in India migrated to Pakistan and settled down in
Lahore or Karachi. The decade between 1959 and 1969 was called
the golden age period. Kay productions released '*Bombay Wāllāh*'
on 26 May 1961 but the Censor Board was blamed for allowing it
to run. In September 1965, all Indian films were taken off the
screen and banned. The ban had existed since 1952 in West

Pakistan and 1962 in East Pakistan but was imposed harshly after 1965.

The years between 1970 and 1977 was the age of the VCR. The Urdu film '*Dōstī*' (friendship) released on 7 February 1971, was the only one to complete 101 weeks of box office but '*Yekkē vālī*' (The female driver of the one-horse carriage) in Panjabi had reached diamond jubilee in 1957. Films dropped from a total of 98 films in 1979 of which forty-two were in Urdu to only fifty-eight films with only twenty-six in Urdu in 1980. In 1990 '*Chūriā*' (bangles), a Punjabi film, grossed Rs180 million. Javed Sheikh's '*Yēh dil āpkā haē*' (This Heart is Yours) in 2002 got Rs200 million ($3.4 million). In 2005, there were requests that the ban on Indian films should be lifted and two years later it was. From now on there was more cooperation between India and Pakistan as far as films were concerned and thus the Pakistani film '*Khudā kē Liyē*' (For God's Sake) was released in 100 cinemas in 20 cities in India.

In 2002 there were the following number of cinema halls in Pakistan.

KP	15
Balochistan	08
Punjab	56
Sindh	43
Islamabad	02

Earlier, for instance in the 1970s, Karachi alone had more than 100 cinemas and more than 200 films were produced and released each year. However, from 2002 a rejuvenation of the film industry was started. Thus, the Universal Multiplex was opened in that year in Karachi. There are these kinds of cinema complexes now in Karachi, Lahore, Islamabad, Faisalabad, Gujranwala, Multan and Hyderabad. (Cinema Website 2010).

According to Hasan Zaidi:

Pakistan used to be among the top 10 film producing countries in
the world, right up until the early–1980s, producing 100 feature films
a year. Today that number is down to the low thirties, most of them
in Punjabi and Pushto. Less than 10 Urdu films were produced last
year whereas at one time that number used to be in the high forties
and Sindhi and Balochi cinema has been wiped off the map. (Zaidi
2010: 58–59).

Pakistani films use the same melodramatic themes which they
inherited from their common ancestor in Bombay. The language
is very similar too though tell-tale words like '*chintā*', '*vishvās*',
'*sāgar*' (sea), etc., are not used. The language varies according to
the identity of the character, the situation and the theme of the
film. A '*maulvī*', for instance, will speak Urdu in a fake, Arabized
accent and may put in more Arabic-origin words than other
characters. College-educated students will sprinkle their
conversation with English words. However, on the whole the
language of Indian films and TV entertainment, and that of these
media in Pakistan are very similar and mutually intelligible. That
is why these media are exchanged—mostly through illegal means
because of official restrictions—between the two countries and
are in high demand among South Asians settled abroad.

LOCALIZATION: URDU ON THE COMPUTER SCREEN

Localization, or technical localization, is merely the translation
of programmes originally written in English into other languages
(Keniston 1997). In Pakistan, for instance, programmes have been
developed in order to use Urdu in place of English in Windows.
The history of the creation of Urdu software is inspiring because
it was initially seen as an exercise in misplaced nationalistic
zeal.

Urdu letters do not follow each other without changing shape. They adopt several shapes depending upon whether they are in the word-initial, medial or terminal positions. Moreover they do not begin at the same height. Their height (*Kursī*) varies according to the word they are used in. Thus, the computer had to be fed, as in logographic systems, with ligatures giving different combinations of letters. Such a programme, not being alphabetical, occupied much space. The first such system was developed by Ahmed Mirza Jameel, proprietor of the Elite Publishers (Karachi).

He saw the Chinese characters being typeset in Singapore in 1979 and got the idea of using this kind of system for Urdu. He spoke to the sales manager of the firm in Singapore and the firm agreed to create a specimen of Urdu which was exhibited in July 1980 in Birmingham. The work of selecting the corpus was accomplished by Matlub ul Hasan Sayyid while their ligatures were determined by Ahmed Mirza Jameel. In six months he created 16,000 ligatures which could create 250,000 words of Urdu.

This was called *Nūrī Nastālīq* (the radiant nastaliq) and was exhibited in Urdu Science College in August 1980. It was adopted by the Jang Group of newspapers which started publishing their newspapers in it. It was also enthusiastically welcomed by Dr Ishtiaq Hussain Qureshi, Chairman of the NLA, in 1980 (Jameel 2002: 8).

Later a number of software—*Shahkār* (masterpiece), *Surkhāb* (a rare and beautiful bird), *Nastālīq Nizāmī* were created. The last mentioned was created by the Pakistan Data Management Services (PDMS) Karachi, established in Karachi in 1978, and it was installed by the National Language Authority in 1995. The PDMS has also created *Māhir* (expert) software which works with the latest version of Windows and processes both Urdu and Sindhi (Hisam 2002).

The second wave of development came in 1998 when FAST, a private university excelling in computer studies in Lahore, organized the National Urdu Computer Seminar on 12 September 1998, in which it was resolved that the Urdu code plate would be standardized (NLA 2002a: 87). The representatives of the NLA were Aqeel Abbas Jafri and Dr Atash Durrani. The Unicode is basically for the Arabic script *naskh* which, according to all researchers, needs less positions than the *Nastālīq* script in which Urdu is written. Atash Durrani became the in-charge of this section and, according to him, exhibited the first code plate based on the American Standard Code International on 5 June 1999 at the Pakistan Science Academy in Islamabad (see NLA 2002: 87; Durrani 2003). Dr Sarmad Hussain, a prominent computational linguist from FAST, carried out linguistic research which fed into the resolution of technical issues. Dr Mohammad Afzal, also present at the historic 1998 seminar, later developed a programme which was supported by Dr Atta ur Rahman, Minister of Science and Technology, in General Pervez Musharraf's government from 1999–2002 (Afzal 2002). This programme was the URLSDF (Urdu and Regional Languages Software Development Forum) which standardized the keyboard and an encoding scheme by 2001. The Internationalization Standardization Organization (ISO) accepted the standards and added them to the Unicode in March 2002. According to Dr Atash Durrani, he met Ahmed Abdullah, incharge of Microsoft Dubai office, in software competition (ITCN Asia 2000 Exhibition) in March 2000 in Karachi and persuaded him to include changes for Urdu in Unicode–4 (NLA 2002: 90–92 and 2003).

Later the Centre of Research in Urdu Language (CRULP) at FAST, headed by Sarmad Hussain, created the *Nafīs Nastālīq* which was released on 14 August 2003. It enables one to make free websites in Urdu *Nastālīq* using Unicode Standard. Sarmad Hussain's team has also developed the *Nafīs Pākistānī Naskh* which allows one to write Sindhi and Pashto. Siraiki, Punjabi, and

Balochi can be written in both the scripts so that there is no major Pakistani language which cannot now be written (Hussain 2004).

Dr Sarmad and his students' research on Urdu—see NLA 2002a and 2003—has provided insights into the processing and use of Urdu for computerization. A number of other people, such as Tahir Mufti, have also contributed in this development (see NLA 2002). Computer-assisted translation from English to Urdu has been made possible by several people including Tafseer Ahmed (Ahmed 2002). The Government of Pakistan has now launched the Urdu localization project. The internet is now displayed in Urdu; English to Urdu translation will be carried out and speech recognition and processing in Urdu will also be possible. This project, also carried out by Sarmad Hussain at CRULP, was completed in 2005 but refinements are going on even now, for instance, an electronic dictionary has been compiled in order to provide terms used in the computer in Urdu (NLA 2005b).

The NLA, then headed by Professor Fateh Mohammad Malik, became very active in localization in Urdu (NLA 2002: 87). At present (August 2010), the NLA is being headed by Iftikhar Arif who is also going ahead with the same project (Personal visit to NLA in August 2010). Standards for e-mail and other procedures have been established over the years and Urdu can now be processed conveniently. The new identity cards made by the Government of Pakistan are now made by computer programmes functioning in Urdu. A new keyboard, compatible with the Urdu programmes, has also been developed.

Urdu websites have been available for quite some time (Jafri 2002), though the official website of Pakistan is in English. Software to process Sindhi is being used but there is little development in Punjabi, Pashto, Balochi, and other languages. This, however, is now technically possible as these languages are all written in variants of the *naskh* and the *nastaliq* scripts. In

short, Urdu is now a language of the computer even though most
of educated Pakistan actually uses English in these domains.

To conclude, this chapter has just touched upon the use of
Urdu in the computer in Pakistan and focused on its use in the
radio and the film industry with special reference to the way the
Urdu-Hindi controversy affected this usage. As the focus was on
the language called Hindustani in British India and Urdu and
Hindi by the various actors who participated in the drama of its
use in the radio and films, we have been able to trace out the
way the linguistic labels—Urdu and Hindi—helped construct,
define and reinforce the communal identities of Hindus and
Muslims which led to the partition of India. And even after that
the identities indexed to these linguistic labels remained
powerful in official narratives though the actual usage in both
India and Pakistan for the purposes of providing information and
especially entertainment remained close to basic Hindustani or
Hindi-Urdu.

15

Conclusion

Urdu and Hindi are so deeply linked to Muslim and Hindu identities in South Asia that this social history of Urdu has inevitably also been a political history. By analyzing writings on the age, origin, names, and history of the use of Urdu in different domains, we have seen how all of these feed into and support some perception of the social identity of Urdu.

The conclusion which emerges from this study can be succinctly summed up as follows. There was a certain Indian language stretching all the way from Peshawar to the border of the Bengal before the Turkish invasions of the subcontinent in the eleventh century. Being an unstandardized, pre-modern language it was a collection of mutually intelligible dialects. The Muslims started called it Hindvi or Hindi, i.e. the language of Hind—Hind being the word they used for India. All these dialects picked up words from the languages of the newcomers—not only soldiers but also merchants, religious figures, mystics, mendicants and camp followers—but the one around the Delhi area (Khari Boli) probably picked up more words than the others. It was this that came to be identified as Hindvi or Hindi which sufi writings from the fourteenth century onwards refer to. The language was also called Dehlavi and later, when it spread into the Gujarat and the Deccan, it came to be known as Gujri, Gujarati and Dakhni. During the eighteenth century it came to be known as Rekhta. Foreigners, especially the Europeans, used to call it the language of Hindustan, Indostan and Hindustani.

For a brief period it was also called Moors but this name was abandoned in favour of the ubiquitous Hindustani.

By the last two decades of the eighteenth century the elite of the imperial cities of Delhi and Agra had started owning and patronizing the language they still called Hindi and Rekhta. However, the sociolect they preferred for their usage was a highly Persianized idiom which they called *Zubān-ē-Urdū-ē-Muallā*—the language of the Exalted City, i.e. Delhi. In time this long descriptive phrase shrank to Urdu.

This implies that the name Urdu was not given to the language because it was created in military camps, despite the fact that the word Urdu does mean 'camp' in Turkish. The language had been in use for at least five centuries before this particular name came to be used for it. In short, calling Urdu a 'military language' or associating it with the Muslim armies is erroneous. Indeed, if its most widely and longest used name, Hindi, is brought into the picture the language is associated with Hindustan—which used to mean the Hindi heartland in medieval parlance—and not with military conquest.

Further, the language had been a product of Hindu-Muslim cultural synthesis from the thirteenth till the eighteenth century. In these five hundred years it had never been seen as a purely Muslim preserve or a marker of Muslim identity. However, when Muslims used it, they did put in more words belonging to their religious and cultural practices which were inevitably in Persian and Arabic. These registers were often called '*Musalmānī bhāshā*' (the language of Muslims) and exist in Bengali (Dil 1993) and Tamil (Alim 1993) as well as other languages. It was not even an elite marker being used by the common people and having no formal niche in the domains of power. By the end of the eighteenth century influential linguistic reformers—who were all poets of Urdu—started making it an elitist class marker. To do this they purged the language of Dakhni words and grammatical constructions, old-fashioned usages, colloquial

words and words of Sanskritic and dialectal (Hindi) origins. Instead of these words they substituted abstruse and unfamiliar words of Persian and Arabic thus making Urdu not just an elitist linguistic marker but also a Muslim identity-marker. Modern Urdu, then, is a Muslim cultural product created artificially by a movement of linguistic reform in the cities of North India towards the end of the eighteenth century.

Modern Hindi was created in the same way soon after—from the beginning of the nineteenth century onwards. Hindi linguistic reformers purged the language of words of Persian and Arabic origin and substituted words of Sanskritic origin. They wrote this new Hindi in the Devanagari script alone thus separating it from modern Urdu which was invariably written in the Perso-Arabic script. Thus Modern Hindi, which was just as artificial a construction as modern Urdu, became the identity marker of Hindus. Thus, British rule over India was coterminous with the creation of two artificially separated varieties of the same language now called Urdu and Hindi. The two varieties were used in the modern-colonial state in ways which made them rivals of each other.

The above study has traced out the use of Urdu in the state, i.e. in the domains of education, print, radio, and cinema. It has also looked at two contradictory associations of Urdu: with the amorous and the erotic and with Islam. And it has traced out the spread of the language by looking at the ways the British rulers themselves acquired the language and how the Indian princely states adopted it for official use or rejected it in favour of some other language.

In a sense all these developments are part of the spread of Urdu. Even the spread of Hindi promotes spoken Urdu. While the Sanskritized Hindi of officialdom may not be intelligible to speakers of Urdu, the popular soap operas and other TV programmes, songs and Bollywood movies—all called Hindi—are intelligible and do spread spoken Urdu or, more accurately, the

language which used to be called Hindustani during British rule
and which may be called ordinary, spoken Urdu-Hindi even now.
Thus, modernity spread Urdu in its spoken form but also helped
divide it in its written and formal registers. What was gained on
the swings was lost on the roundabouts.

The division of the language into their formal style is political
and we have encountered the communal, identity politics of
Hindu and Muslim nationalism in much of this study. For
instance, scholarship is polarized and blinkered when politics
intervenes. Thus, the politics of names favours the name Urdu—
the most recent name for the language—rather than Hindi
because Pakistanis would not identify their national language
with Hind (the land of the Hindus in their perception). And the
Hindus too do not want to make a free gift of the name Hindi—a
name they have reserved for Sanskritized Hindi—to a language
they now regard as an alien 'Other'. As for the Indian Muslims,
they do not want to lose the name Urdu because it is their
cultural heritage and a symbol of their identity.

As for the place of origin, Pakistani nationalists—albeit not all
scholars—favour theories which make areas now in Pakistan the
place of birth of the language. But this is not as major an
impediment to clear thinking as the insistence that Urdu is a
Muslim language. This particular theory begins by calling Urdu
a mixed language (*Khichrī zubān*) which implies that it is a pidgin.
Pidgins are reduced languages and they are nobody's mother-
tongues to begin with. But this erroneous and not very
prestigious ancestry is accepted gladly because it supports the
theory that words of Muslim heritage languages—Persian,
Arabic, Turkish—created Urdu. The other possibility that the
ancestor of Urdu, like the ancestor of English, already existed
and picked up words of foreign languages does not appeal to
most historians of Urdu. The fact that English is also a mixed
language, having added most learned words from Latin and

Greek via Norman French, but is called an Anglo-Saxon language not a pidgin goes unnoticed by the historians of Urdu.

As for Urdu's age, the impressionistic writings of people like Mir Ammam have made their niche in the textbooks of Urdu but nationalistic historiography is otherwise keen to appropriate another five hundred years or so to the history of the language. But here a dilemma intervenes. For Historians of Hindi these five hundred years are part of the history of Hindi. For historians of Urdu they are part of the history of Urdu. In fact, as we have seen, they are part of the history of the common ancestor of these languages. But the tendency among historians is to parade texts written by their religious compatriots while glossing over those of the 'other' for one reason or the other. One stratagem is to use the name of a dialect—Avadhi, Braj Bhasha, Bhojpuri, etc.—when a certain text is not to be given attention. But when it is, this objection is brushed aside and the dialect is taken as part of the ancestry of Hindi or Urdu as the case may be. In general, while Kabir Das, Tulsi Das and the Nath Panthis are appropriated by the historians of Hindi the Muslims content themselves with the scattered sentences in the work of the Sufis or texts written by Muslims even if the text in question—such as Fakhar Din Nizami's *Masnavī Kadam Rāō Padam Rāō* (1430 to 1435) is mostly unintelligible to modern readers of Urdu.

More ominous for the inhabitants of South Asia was the way the politicized modern Hindi and Urdu came to be used in the domains of courts, offices, education, printing, information, and entertainment. Under colonial rule, and even now, these domains are major employers. Hence, which version of the common Hindustani they would prefer for employment became a major economic and political question. The census created and hardened linguistic identities which eventually came to correspond to religious ones. Thus, if Urdu was the language of schooling then Hindi had to lose out and vice versa. If Urdu was the language of the courts and the lower administrative offices,

then Muslims and the Hindu Kaesth class got preference in employment over the other Hindus. If Hindi books and newspapers were sold more than Urdu ones, then the profits went to the Hindu community making the Muslims lose out. And if Urdu came to be used in the radio, then jobs went to Muslims. In short, linguistic choice was always an economic and political choice. That is why the Hindi-Urdu controversy, which has generally been seen as part of Hindi-Muslim nationalist politics before the partition of India, is also an economic and cultural issue. It is a question of who gets jobs and recognition and social prestige. It is, ultimately a question of being considered fully human and equal. For linguistic prejudice is like racism. The snobbish Delhiites and Lucknawis looked down upon the Urdu spoken by the Hindus as well as Punjabis. And the peer pressure of Hindi-speakers in parts of urban India make Muslim Urdu-speaking children hide the fact that they speak/x/not/kh/at home. Linguistic shaming, like other forms of shaming, ultimately depend upon accepting the legitimacy of certain norms. These norms, in turn, are shaped by the acceptance of cultural hegemony. The spreading of this hegemony by the dissemination of these norms is what we have been studying.

Thus, when a princely state accepts Urdu as an official language it facilitates outsiders who use this language better than the local elite. If it accepts Hindi—as the Rajputana states did—it reduces Muslim cultural ascendancy and increases the chances of employment and cultural domination of the Hindi-using middle classes. These linguistic decisions, therefore, play into local as well as South Asian politics. They create, support and strengthen identities and tend to polarize South Asia into huge alienated religious and nationalistic (Pakistani and Indian) identities.

In the conclusion of his book on Hindi nationalism Alok Rai has this comment on the continued official dissemination of Sanskritized Hindi:

> ... this "Hindi" continues to exert a poisonous influence through its
> continued dominance within the educational system.... This official
> "Hindi" is primarily responsible for the construction of cultural
> memory in the Hindi region: in classroom after classroom, in childish
> essay and scholarly dissertation, the practice of this "Hindi" is a
> ritual re-enactment of the logic of partition (Rai 2001: 119).

The same comment can be made of the Pakistani use of Urdu as
the carrier of the Pakistani official ideology (Rahman 2002:
515)—the ideas of there being such essential differences between
Muslims and Hindus as to call them 'two nations', the
sacralisation of war, the military, and conquest, etc.—though in
this case it is not so much the diction itself which is to blame but
the historical narrative about the language: that Urdu has
military antecedents, that it is a 'Muslim language', that the
Hindus tried to suppress it with British help and so on. In short,
the consequence of the partition, which could have been peace,
is made into a permanent state of war.

   This is the past and present of Urdu. What is its future? But
is this question correctly worded? Or would it be more precise
to ask: what is the future of Urdu-Hindi? Persianized Urdu? And
Sanskritized Hindi? These questions can be answered with
reference to these varieties of a once-common language outside
South Asia and within it.

   First, let us consider Urdu-Hindi abroad. The official, written
Hindi and Urdu are taught as nationalistic enterprises or identity
symbols. The governments of India and Pakistan promote their
official varieties in their iconic scripts. Thus, Urdu is promoted
through Urdu chairs established in foreign countries and through
courses offered in it by Pakistani educational institutions for
foreigners.

   It is also taught by many universities in the world but,
according to a survey of R.L. Schmidt of the University of Oslo,
to a far lesser degree than Hindi. In this survey of thirty-five
universities in Europe, the USA, Canada and Australia these are

forty-two regular positions for Hindi; but only seventeen for Urdu while there are twelve Hindi-Urdu positions (But here the term refers to the teaching of basic Hindi and Urdu in their respective scripts). Predictably, in the year of the survey, there were 690 students of Hindi and 162 of Urdu (Quoted from Oesterheld 2002: 127–128).

The literature available on Europe—Germany (Oesterheld 2002), Britain (Russell 1982), France (Desoulieres, 1995), the Czech Republic (Marek 1995)—mentions the lack of teaching material. The present author's own observation in American universities (2004–05) concurs with this but, it may be noted, that the instructors either cannot or do not enforce high standards on their students so that Urdu is often taken as an easy option by students of South Asian origin with some knowledge of the language.

The teaching of Urdu in Britain began in 1973 and, by the time the report on minority languages was published in 1985 many cities had classes in the language (Stubbs 1985). Unfortunately this teaching also follows the same pattern of treating the language as a soft option though, for pioneers like Ralph Russell (1918–2008) writing in the 1970s when the experiment of mother-tongue teaching was going on, it was a precious cultural heritage and a linguistic right (Russell 1979). Such attitudes are not very helpful in preserving Urdu or, for that matter, Hindi. Though, because of the post-9/11 interest in Pakistan and Islam, Urdu is required by the intelligence organizations of the world. Ironically enough, this may provide some unexpected support to official Urdu.

But as far as spoken Urdu-Hindi is concerned, it has spread whenever people from the Hindi belt and the Punjab have settled down either in pre- or post-partition days. Between '1834 to 1916 nearly 1.2 million people from the Indian subcontinent were sent as indentured labourers to work in European colonies' (Barz and

Siegel 1988: 1). Large number of people in these former colonies still speak varieties of Hindustani as the following chart shows:

Country	Percentage of Indian Populations @	Language Spoken *
Mauritius	69 per cent	Mauritian Bhojpuri
Guyana	55 per cent	Guyanese Bhojpuri
Trinidad	50 per cent	Trinidad Bhojpuri
Suriname	37 per cent	Suriname Hindustani
Fiji	49 per cent	Fiji Hindustani
Source: @ Barz and Siegel 1988: Table 2, p. 2. * Ibid., Table 3, p. 5.		

These transplanted varieties diverge from the dialect at home—which has itself changed—and have borrowed words from their languages of contact. Since the 1920s 'both Hindu and Muslim missionaries from India started visiting Mauritius and other countries, and further promoted the use of S[tandard] H[indi] or Urdu' (Barz and Siegel 1988: 9). Yet, despite this enactment of the Hindu-Muslim/Hindi-Urdu conflict abroad, the local varieties survive in popular speech. A play entitled '*Adhūrā Sapnā*' (incomplete dream) given in the book *Language Transplanted*, is quite intelligible to ordinary speakers of both Urdu and Hindi in Pakistan and India or, indeed, anywhere in the world (Barz and Siegel 1988: 222).

In Britain, despite the fact that the Mirpuri working-class community who were the first settlers in large numbers from Pakistan, speakers of Mirpuri Pahari—a variety of Greater Punjabi—at home, they also understand and use Urdu in formal domains and while interacting with other Pakistanis. The same is the case of the US and the Arab world where Pakistanis and Indians—even if their mother-tongues are other languages—interact with each other either in English or in Urdu-Hindi. The

entertainment media, as mentioned earlier, operates in this language. This spoken language, then, has a great future being sustained by millions of speakers and a huge entertainment industry.

It has, in my view, a brighter future than the officially sustained, formal, written registers of Persianized Urdu and Sanskritized Hindi in the Perso-Arabic and the Devanagari scripts which the rival states of India and Pakistan and the academy promotes. However, it must be conceded that literature, although tipping towards Persianization in Urdu and Sanskritization in Hindi, is produced in the diaspora and has survived so far (for a sample of Urdu poetry in the UK see Lakhnavi 1981: 511–552).

And now coming back to South Asia before ending this book. We have just mentioned that for the last two hundred years or so, since modern Urdu and Hindi separated from each other, we have lived in perpetual strife. The peoples have drifted apart and so have the languages. Even if one listens to the announcements in the Pakistan International Airlines and the Air India one cannot help despairing at the depth of the linguistic boundary-marking and 'othering'. The PIA goes out of its way to use Perso-Arabic and the Air India Sanskritic diction. A common language of such announcements—as well as many other public discourses—could have been made with borrowings from English but South Asian official energies are still spent upon accentuating linguistic cleavages not upon eliminating them.

Is it possible to arrest this trend and promote peace, harmony and give-and-take? I believe it is possible by removing the obstacles to peace—such as Kashmir, terrorism and water disputes—but that is in the hands of the ruling elites of the two countries. What is in the hands of scholars is to debunk the myths which link Urdu with military origins or deny that words of Hindi—such common words as *prēm, sāgar, naēnā, chintā*—are part of the heritage of Urdu. It is, after all, only the truth to say

that even now—after about two hundred years of separation and drifting apart—spoken Urdu and Hindi are the same language. It is only by not losing sight of the continuities and shared cultural features among Pakistanis and (north) Indians that we can hope to transcend the mutual hatred which threatens to annihilate this ancient land.

Glossary

The meanings of sentences and longer quotations from languages other than English are given in the text. Most individual words are also explained parenthetically in the text or the notes. Words given below are those which are not explained or from samples of old Urdu-Hindi the meanings of which remain doubtful or ambiguous.

In addition to the standard dictionaries of Urdu and Persian, the following specialized dictionaries have been used to prepare this glossary: Khan (1969); Jalibi (1973a); Platts (1884) and Pal (1993).

A

Andāz (F)	Style
Akhbār (A)	Newspaper: plural of news (*Khabar*)
Adālat (A)	Court of law
'Arzī (A)	Letter; petition (also written as *urze*). From the Arabic word *'Arz* (=state; to express).
Āshōb (F)	Devastation, bereavement, tragedy, sorrow.
Ashrāf (A)	Gentry; decent people; of high class.

B

Bināt (A)	Daughters
Bhāt (H)	Rice. (also spelled *bhaat*).
Bidaī (H)	The ceremony of sending the bride to her husband's house. Also pronounced *vidaī*. From Arabic *Vidā* (=to leave; to go away). With/b/it is assimilated into Hindi.
Bhajan (H)	Devotional song
Basātīn (A)	Gardens. Pl. of *bōstān* (=garden).
Bhāg (H)	Luck
Bhājī (H)	Portion of something, part of eatables.
Baēnā (H)	Sweetmeats or food distributed in ceremonies; kind of jewelry; cooked vegetable.
Basun (H)	Tranquillity; place of rest.

C

Chaprāssī (H)	Office attendant.
Chand (F)	Some.
Chittū (Punj)	Fool; coward.

D

Dulhan (H)	Bride.
Dāl (H)	Pulses (also written as *daal*).
Dewānī (F)	Court in which cases about property, financial transactions, etc., are tried.
Dīvān (F)	Poetic collection.
Durbārī (P)	Courtier.
Dēvēgā (U/H)	Will give (archaic form of *dē gā*).
Dhan bhāg (H)	Good luck
Dhar (H)	Put; place
Dādrā (H)	Kind of song.

F

Faujdārī (A/F)	Courts which deal with criminal cases.

G

Gurmukhī (H)	*Gurū* means teacher; *mukh* means mouth. It means literally 'that which comes out of the Guru's mouth' and refers to the script of Punjabi derived from the Brahmi family of scripts.
Gillī Dandā (H)	An indigenous game played with a small stick sharpened at both ends which is thrown up and then hit by a larger stick.

H

Haq (A)	Truth; right; God.
Hikāyāt (A)	Stories (Sing. *Hikāēt*).
Hādī (A)	An expert in some art; dominant; ascendant; guide.

I

Inshā (A)	Style and rules of letter-writing.
Istiqrār (A)	To stop; to be settled; to come to peace.

J

Jaw Jehannum (Mixed)	British pronunciation of *Jāō Jahannum mẽ* (=go to hell! An invective use by the British in India. (*Jahannum* (A) c. hell).
Janam (H)	Birth
Jit (Punj)	Where; at which place; in which direction; whom; when;

K

Kanahiyā (H)	Shri Krishna Ji; Beloved; Beautiful boy.
<u>*Kh*</u>*ilāfat* (A)	Caliphate; movement in support of the Ottoman caliphate of Turkey in India in the 1920s.

Khichrī (H)	A dish prepared by boiling rice and pulses together. Mixture.
Kursī (A)	Chair; height; elevation.
Kāshtkār (F)	Tiller of the soil.
Kāshtkārānā (F)	Of farmers; of tillers of the soil.
Kāran (H)	Because of; reason.
Khānqāh (A)	Hospice of mystics.
Kārī (A)	See Qārī
Khālsā (Punj)	Army of the Sikhs; leaders of Sikhs.
Kanta (H)	Beloved, friend, husband; happy mind.
Kāg (H)	Crow.
Khan (H)	Treasure; portion of food; cloud; happened; transpired; room.

L

Liyākat (A)	Competence; wisdom.

M

Mirāt (A)	Mirror.
Muntakhab (A)	Selected.
Mullā (A)	Muslim clergyman; leader of prayers.
Maulvī (A)	A more respectable title for a Muslim clergyman than Mulla.
Maulānā (A)	A more respectable title for a Muslim clergyman than Maulvi.
Mofussil (A)	Rural areas; peripheral areas.
Muqābizāt (A)	Boxes of embellishments.
Mēm (English)	Indigenized form of 'madam'. Used in South Asia for European women.
Mēmsāhib (mixed)	More respectable variant of the above.
Malichās (S)	Unclean; outside the caste system of Hindus; outsiders; aliens; used for Muslims also.
Maktab (A)	Muslim elementary school for children teaching the reading of the Quran without meaning.
Madrassā (A)	Muslim advanced school teaching the religious sciences.
Muallā (A)	Exalted; high.
Mad (H)	Intoxication; lust; happiness.
Madh (H)	Wine; intoxicant; spring; pride.

N

Nisā (A)	Woman.
Niswã (A)	Of women.
Nohā (A)	Lamentation.
Nālā (F)	Cry; weeping.

Numberdār (mixed)	The officially recognized head of a village; person responsible for depositing revenue in the government treasury.
Nākā (H)	Eye of needle; avenue; entrance to city gate; extremity of path; police outpost.
Nautankī (H)	Theatre; drama; skit; folk theatre.
Nizām (A)	Organization.
Nafīs (P)	Elegant, refined.

P

Pī (H)	Lover.
Pītam (H)	Lover.
Pand (F)	Moral maxims; advice.
Paisā (H)	Unit of currency. There used to be 4 paisas in an anna and 16 annas in a rupee. Nowadays there are 100 paisas in a rupee.
Pinjrā (H)	Cage.
Pāhnā (H)	Guest; visitor; son-in-law.
Pardēsī (H)	Outsider; visitor from some other place.
Patvārī (H)	Keeper of ledgers on land holdings. Lowest official of the revenue service.

Q

Qārī (A)	One who recites the Quran in an Arabic pronunciation (also spelled *kārī*).

R

Rāj (S)	Rule; government; rulers.
Rām Līlā (H)	Performance of the story of Ram Chandar Ji.
Rubāe (A)	Quatrain.
Rajīvẽ (Punj)	Being full; being surfeited; pleased; wealthy.

S

Sadar (A)	'*Sadr*' means chest in Arabic. In Urdu it refers to the main part of cities where officials used to live. That part of the city where courts and administrative offices were located; the part of Indian cities created by the British.
Shakist (F)	Defeat.
Shakistā (F)	Literally defeated or broken. A kind of short hand in Urdu in which letters are written in a broken, abbreviated form.
Sūfī (A)	Muslim mystic.
Sarijan (H)	Deity.
Samā'ā (A)	Music, singing.

Subah (A)	Morning.
Sūbā (A)	Province.
Shām (F)	Evening.
Shab (F)	Night.
Shāhmukhī (mixed)	*Shāh* (F) means king; *mukh* (H) means mouth. *Shāhmukhī* literally means 'that which comes out of the king's mouth'. It refers to the Perso-Arabic script for writing Punjabi.
Shudh (H)	Pure; correct; authentic.
Sūlī (H)	Crucifix.
Sanad (A)	Diploma; degree, certificate.
Salātīn (A)	Rulers. (Sing; sultān).
Shahr (F)	City.
Sākī (H)	Not clear—but probably stories of brave people.
Sāka (H)	Tales sung about brave people by Hindus and Sikhs.

T

Taēhzīb (A)	Civilization; culture; refinement.
Tat (Punj)	Fruit; base; essence; reality; soul;
Talī (H)	Sole of foot; bottom.
Thumrī (H)	Kind of song.

U

Urzī (A)	See '*Arzī*.
Urūs (A)	Bride.
'*Usmaniyyā* (A)	Ottoman; refers to the Nizam's regime in the Deccan in this book.

Z

Zamindār (F)	Owner of land; one responsible for something; landowner responsible for depositing revenue in the government treasury. The name of a newspaper.
Zār (F)	Place; excess; lamentation; one who is weak on humiliated.
Zindagī (F)	Life.

Bibliography

SECTION–1

REPORTS, OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS AND UNPUBLISHED THESES

(Some of these sources have been used for compiling charts of data and are not given separately in the text)

Adam, William. 1835. 'First Report on the State of Education in Bengal'. In Long, J. (comp & ed.). 1868: 1–84. *Adam's Reports on Vernacular Education in Bengal and Behar, Submitted to Government in 1835, 1836 and 1838.* Calcutta: Printed at the Home Secretariat Press.

Adm. Hyd. 1886. *Administration Report of His Highness the Nizam's Dominions for 1294 Fasli (1884–1885).* Bombay: Printed at the Times of India Steam Press.

Adm. NWP & O. 1899. *Report on the Administration of the N. W. Provinces & Oudh for the year ending 31st March 1898.* Allahabad: Printed by the North-Western Provinces & Oudh Govt. Press.

Adm. NWP & O. 1901. *Report on the Administration of the N. W. Provinces & Oudh for the year ending 31st March 1900.* Allahabad: Printed by the North-Western Provinces & Oudh Govt. Press.

Adm. NWP & O. 1907. *Report on the Administration of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh 1905–06.* Allahabad: Government Press, United Provinces of Agra and Oudh.

Adm. Pun. 1866. *General Report on the Administration of the Punjab Territories for the Year 1865–66.* Lahore: Punjab Printing Company's Press.

Adm. Pun. 1867. *General Report on the Administration of the Punjab Territories for the Year 1866–67.* Lahore: Punjab Printing Company's Press.

Adm. Pun. 1869. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1868–69.* Lahore: Punjab Printing Company.

Adm. Pun. 1873. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1872–73.* Lahore: Printed at the Government Civil Secretariat Press.

Adm. Pun. 1874. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1873–74.* Lahore: Printed at the Government Civil Secretariat Press.

Adm. Pun. 1876. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1875–76.* Lahore: Printed at the Government Civil Secretariat Press.

Adm. Pun. 1881. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1880–81.* Lahore: Printed at the Government Civil Secretariat Press.

Adm. Pun. 1882. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1881–82.* Lahore: Printed at the Government Civil Secretariat Press.

Adm. Pun. 1889. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1888–89.* Lahore: Printed at the Punjab Government Press.

Adm. Pun. 1890. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1889–90.* Lahore: Printed at the Punjab Government Press.

Adm. Pun. 1893. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1891–92.* Lahore: Printed at the Punjab Government Press.

Adm. Pun. 1898. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1896–97.* Lahore: Printed at the Punjab Government Press.

Adm. Pun. 1899. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1898–99.* Lahore: Printed at the Punjab Government Press.

Adm. Pun. 1902b. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1901–02.* Lahore: Printed at the Punjab Government Press.

Adm. Pun. 1904a. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1902–03.* Lahore: Printed at the Punjab Government Press.

Adm. Pun. 1908. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1906–07.* Lahore: Printed at the Punjab Government Press.

Adm. Pun. 1913. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1911–12.* Lahore: Printed at the Punjab Government Press.

Adm. Pun. 1914. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1912–13.* Lahore: Printed at the Punjab Government Press.

Adm. Pun. 1915. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1913–14.* Lahore: Printed at the Punjab Government Press.

Adm. Pun. 1917. *Report on the Administration of the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1915–16.* Lahore: Printed at the Punjab Government Press.

Adm. Pun. 1923a. *Punjab Administration Report 1921–22 Vol.-I.* Lahore: Printed by the Superintendent, Government Printing, Punjab.

Adm. UP. 1912a. *Report on the Administration of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh 1910–1911.* Allahabad: Printed by F. Luker, Superintendent Govt. Press, United Provinces.

Adm. UP. 1914. *Report on the Administration of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh 1912–1913.* Allahabad: Printed by F. Luker, Superintendent Govt. Press, United Provinces.

Adm. UP. 1916b. *Report on the Administration of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh 1915–1916.* Allahabad: Printed by the Superintendent, Govt Press.

Adm. UP. 1925. *Report on the Administration of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh 1923–1924.* Allahabad: Printed by F. Luker, Supdt, Govt. Press, United Provinces.

Adm. UP. 1926 *Report on the Administration of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh 1924–1925.* Allahabad: Printed by F. Luker, Supdt. Govt. Press, United Provinces.

Administration Report of His Highness the Nizam's Dominions for 1294 Fasli (1884–1885). 1886. Bombay: Printed at the Times of India Steam Press.

Afzal, Mohammad. 2002. '*Urdū Zābitā Sufhā K ī Mayār Bandī: Lōh ba Lōh Ahwāl*'. In NLA 2002: 25–32.

Ahmad, Rizwan. 2007. 'Shifting Dunes: Changing Meanings of Urdu in India'. Unpublished PhD dissertation, The University of Michigan.

Ahmed, Tafsir. 2002. '*Urdū Mashīnī Mutarājam kē Mōjid Tafsīr Ahmed*'. Interview by Aleem Ahmad. In NLA 2002: 42–46.

AIR. 1939. *Hindustani: All India Radio kī Ijāzat Sē* (Hindustani: with permission of the AIR). Delhi: Maktaba Jamia Delhi.

Ali, Chiragh. 1880–1886. *Hyderabad (Deccan) Under Sir Salar Jang.* 4 Vols. Bombay: Printed at the Education Society's Press, Byilla.

Ali, Syed Mahdi. 1883–1886. *Hyderabad Affairs.* 8 vols. Bombay: Printed at the Times of India Steam Press.

Ali, Syed Mahdi. 1886. *Hyderabad Affairs: Supplementary Volume 8.* Bombay: Printed at the Times of India Steam Press.

Ali, Syed Mahdi. 1889. *Hyderabad Affairs.* Vols. 9–10. London: Talbot Brothers.

Anjuman. 1940. *Jāēzā Zubān-e-Urdū* Vol. 1: *Riāsathāē Rājputānā* (Survey of Urdu in the Rajputana states). Delhi: Anjuman-e-Taraqqi-e-Urdu.

Anjuman. P. 1866. *Report of the Anjuman-i-Panjab or the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge for the Year 1865.* Lahore: Punjabee Press.

Blumhardt, J.F. 1905. *Catalogue of the Marathi, Gujarati, Bangali, Assamese, Oriya, Pushtu and Sindhi Manuscripts in the Library of the British Museum.* London: The British Museum.

Blumhardt. J.F. 1926. *Catalogue of the Hindustani Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Census, Kashmir. 1912. *Census of India, 1911: Vol. XX, Kashmir, Part–1, Report* (comp. and ed.) Matin Uz Zaman. Lucknow: Printed at the Nawal Kishore Press.

Census, Kashmir. 1923. *Census of India, 1921: Vol. XXII. Kashmir, Part–1 Report* (comp. and ed.) Chaudhri Khushi Muhammad. Lahore: Printed at the Mufid-i-Aam Press.

Census, MP. 1954. *Census of India, 1951: Vol. XV Madhya Pradesh and Bhopal Part–1A Report.* Gwalior: Govt. Central Press, Madhya Bharat.

Census-I. 1875. *Census of British India 1871–72.* London: Printed by George Edward Eyre and William Spottiswoode, Her Majesty's Stationery Office [HMSO].

Census-I. 1883. *Census of British India 1881.* London: Printed by Eyre and Spottiswoode, [HMSO].

Census-I. 1893. *Census of British India 1891: General Report.* London: Printed for the Indian Govt. by Eyre and Spottiswoode, printers to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty.

Census-I. 1903. *Census of India, 1901 Vol. 1 India, Part 1, Report.* Calcutta: Superintendent of Govt. Printing.

Census-I. 1933. *Census of India, 1931 Vol. 1 India, Part 1, Report.* Delhi: Manager of Publications.

Census-I. 1943. *Census of India 1941: Vol. 1 India, Part 1* by M.W.M. Yeats. Simla: Manager of Publications.

Census-I. 1964. *Census of India 1961: Vol. I India, Part II-C (ii) Language Tables*, (ed.) A. Mitra (ICS). Delhi: Registrar General and Ex- Officio Census Commissioner for India.

Census-I. 1976. *Census of India, 1971: Social and Cultural Tables Part C-II* by A. Chandra Sekhar. New Delhi: Registrar General.

Census-I. 1987. *Census of India 1981, Series-I, India: Household and Household population by Language Mainly Spoken in the Household* by P. Padmanhaba. New Delhi: Registrar General.

Census-I. 1988. *Census of India, 1981: Households and Household population by language Mainly Spoken in the Household Series 22, Paper–1 of 1987*. New Delhi: Registrar General.

Census-I. 2001. *Census of India 2001: Language: India, States and Union Territories Tables*. New Delhi: Office of the Registrar General, India.

Census-K. 1912 Part–1. ir, *Census of India, 1911: Vol. xx. Kashmir Part 1, Report* by Matin uz Zaman. Lucknow: Printed at the Nawal Kishore Press.

Census-K. 1912. Part–2. *Census of India, 1911: Vol. xx. Kashmir Part ii: Tables* by Matin uz Zaman. Lucknow: Printed at the Nawal Kishore Press.

Census-K. 1923. *Census of India, 1921: Vol. xxii Kashmir Part 1: Report* by K.B.: Chaudhri Khushi Mahammed. Lahore: Printed at the Mufid-i Am Press.

Census-MP. 1954. *Census of India, 1951: Vol. xv Madhya Bharat & Bhopal Part 1-A Report*. Gwalior: Govt. Central Press, Madhya Bharat.

Census-P. 2001. *1998 Census Report of Pakistan*. Islamabad: Population Census Organization, Statistics Division, Govt. of Pakistan.

Census-UP. 1952. *Census of India 1951 Vol. II: Uttar Pradesh: Part 1-B Subsidiary Tables*. Allahabad: Superintendent, Printing and Stationery UP.

Census-UP. 1953. *Census of India: Uttar Pradesh Part II-C Age and Social Tables*. Allahabad: Superintendent of Printing and Stationery, UP.

Census-UP. 1967. *Census of India 1961 Vol. XV: Uttar Pradesh*. Lucknow: Manager of Publication.

Census-UP. 1996. *Census of India 1991. Series–25 Uttar Pradesh Part IV-B (ii) Religion (Table C–9)*. Lucknow: Directorate of Census Operations UP.

Cinema Evidence II. 1928. *India Cinematograph Committee 1927–28 Evidence Vol. 2. Oral Evidence of Witnesses Examined at Lahore, Peshawar, Lucknow and Calcutta, with their Written Statements*. Calcutta: Govt. of India, Central Publication Branch.

Cinema Evidence III. 192*8. Indian Cinematograph Committee 1927–28 Evidence Vol. 3 Oral Evidence of Witnesses Examined at Madras, Rangoon, Mandalay, Calcutta (one witness), Jamshedpur, Nagpur and Delhi, with their Written Statements*. Calcutta: Govt. of India, Central Publication Branch.

Cinema Evidence IV. 1928. *Indian Cinematograph Committee 1927–28 Evidence Vol. 4. Oral Evidence of Witnesses Examined, Memoranda from Provincial Governments and Miscellaneous Papers*. Calcutta: Govt. of India, Central Publication Branch.

Cinema. 1928. *Report of the Indian Cinematograph Committee 1927–28.* Madras: Printed by the Superintendent, Govt. Press & Published by the Govt. of India Central Publication Branch, Calcutta.

Cinema. Evidence 1. 1928. *Indian Cinematograph Committee 1927–28 Evidence Vol. 1. Oral Evidence of Witnesses Examined at Bombay and Karachi, With Their Written Statements.* Calcutta: Govt. of India, Central Publication Branch.

Directors. 1802. 'Letter to Our Governor-General in Council, at Fort William, in Bengal', 27 January. In Public 1810: 58–63.

Edn. B. 1837. *Report of the General Committee of Public Instruction of the Presidency of Fort William in Bengal for the Year 1836.* Calcutta: Printed at the Baptist Mission Press.

Edn. B. 1841. *Report of the General Committee of Public Instruction of the Presidency of Fort William in Bengal for the Year 1839–40.* Calcutta: G.H. Huttmann, Bengal Military Orphan Press.

Edn. Com. 1939. *Report of the Primary and Secondary Education Re-Organization Committee Appointed by the Government of the United Provinces.* Allahabad: Superintendent, Printing and Stationery, United Provinces.

Edn. Com. NWP & O. 1884. *Appendix to the Education Commission Report: The North-Western Provinces and Oudh Provincial Committee.* Calcutta: Printed by the Superintendent of Govt. Printing, India.

Edn. Com. NWP. 1884. *Report by the North-Western Provinces and Oudh Provincial Committee with Evidence Taken Before the Committee and Memorials Addressed to the Education Commission.* Calcutta: Superintendent of Govt. Printing.

Edn. Emp. 1886. *Selections from the Records of the Govt. of India, Home Dept. No CCV. Serial No. 2 Correspondence on the Subject of the Education of the Muhammaden Community in British India and their Employment in the Public service Generally.* Calcutta: Printed by the Superintendent of Govt. Printing.

Edn. NWP & O 1892. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh for the Year 1891–92.* Allahabad: North-Western Provinces and Oudh Govt. Press.

Edn. NWP & O 1894. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh for the Year 1893–94.* Allahabad: North-Western Provinces and Oudh Govt. Press.

Edn. NWP & O. 1878. *Report on Progress of Education in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh for the Year 1877–78* by K.T.H. Griffith. Allahabad: North-Western Provinces and Oudh Government Press.

Edn. NWP & O. 1884. *Report on Progress of Education in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh for the Year ending 31 March 1884* by K.T.H. Griffith Inspector General of Schools, NWP & Oudh. Allahabad: North-Western Provinces and Oudh Government Press.

Edn. NWP & O. 1886. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh for the Year 1885–86.* Allahabad: North-Western Provinces and Oudh Govt. Press.

Edn. NWP & O. 1889. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh for the Year 1888–89.* Allahabad: North-Western Provinces and Oudh Government Press.

Edn. NWP & O. 1891. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh for the Year 1890–91.* Allahabad: North-Western Provinces and Oudh Government Press.

Edn. NWP & O. 1893. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh for the Year 1892–93.* Allahabad: North-Western Provinces and Oudh Government Press.

Edn. NWP & O. 1895. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh for the Year 1894–95.* Allahabad: North-Western Provinces and Oudh Government Press.

Edn. UP. 1903. *General Report on Public Instruction in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh for the Year ending 31 March 1902.* Allahabad: Printed at the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh Government Press.

Edn. NWP & O. 1912 *General Report on Public Instruction in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh for the Year ending 31 March 1912.* Allahabad: Superintendent Govt. Press, UP.

Edn. NWP. 1844. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North Western Provinces of the Bengal Presidency for 1843–44.* Agra: Printed by L. Baptist at the Agra Ukhbar Press.

Edn. NWP. 1846. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North Western Provinces of the Bengal Presidency for 1844–45.* Agra: Printed by E.H. Longden at the Secundra Orphan Press.

Edn. NWP. 1847. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North Western Provinces of the Bengal Presidency for 1845–46.* Agra: Printed by E.H. Longden at the Secundra Orphan Press.

Edn. NWP. 1848. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North Western Provinces of the Bengal Presidency for 1846–47.* Agra: Printed by W.M. Haycock at the Secundra Orphan Press.

Edn. NWP. 1848. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North Western Provinces of the Bengal Presidency for 1847–48.* Agra: W.M. Haycock, Secundra Orphan Press.

Edn. NWP. 1849. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North Western Provinces of the Bengal Presidency for 1847–48.* Agra: Secundra Orphan Press.

Edn. NWP. 1850. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North Western Provinces of the Bengal Presidency for 1848–49.* Agra: Printed at the Secundra Orphan Press.

Edn. NWP. 1852. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North Western Provinces of the Bengal Presidency for 1850–51.* Agra: Printed at the Secundra Orphan Press.

Edn. NWP. 1853a. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North Western Provinces of the Bengal Presidency for 1851–52.* Agra: Printed at the Secundra Orphan Press.

Edn. NWP. 1853b. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North Western Provinces of the Bengal Presidency for 1852–53.* Agra: Printed at the Secundra Orphan Press.

Edn. NWP. 1854. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North Western Provinces of the Bengal Presidency for 1853–54.* Agra: Printed at the Secundra Orphan Press.

Edn. NWP. 1856. *General Report on Public Instruction in the North Western Provinces of the Bengal Presidency for 1854–55, with Appendices* by Henry Stewart Reid, Director General of Schools, NWP. Agra: Printed at the Secundra Orphan Press.

Edn. NWP. 1859a. *Report on the State of Popular Education in the North Western Provinces for 1856–57, and 1857–58* by Henry Stewart Reid. Director of Public Instruction, NWP Benares: Published Under Authority of the Govt. of the NWP.

Edn. NWP. 1859b. *Report on the State of Popular Education in the North Western Provinces for 1858–59* by H.S. Reid, DPI, NWP. Benares: Published Under Authority of the Govt. of the NWP.

Edn. NWP. 1861a. *Report on the State of Popular Education in the North Western Provinces for 1859–60* by H.S. Reid, DPI, NWP. Allahabad: Printed at the Government Press.

Edn. NWP. 1861b. *Report on the State of Popular Education in the North Western Provinces for 1860–61* by H.S. Reid, DPI, NWP. Allahabad: Printed at the Govt. Press.

Edn. NWP. 1864. *Report on Progress of Education in the North-Western Provinces for the Year 1863–64* by M. Kempson, DPI, NWP. Allahabad: Printed at the Government Press, North-Western Provinces.

Edn. NWP. 1866. *Report on the Progress of Education in the North-Western Provinces for the Year 1865–66* by M. Kempson, DPI, NWP. Allahabad: Printed at the Government Press, North-Western Provinces.

Edn. NWP. 1873. *Report of the North-Western Provinces for 1872–73 Part-I* by M. Kempson. Allahabad: Printed at the North-Western Provinces Govt. Press.

Edn. NWP. 1874. *Report of the North-Western Provinces for 1873–74 Part-I 1873–74* by M. Kempson. Allahabad: Printed at the North-Western Provinces Govt. Press.

Edn. O. 1871a. *Report upon the Progress of Education in the Province of Oudh 1869.* Lucknow: Printed at the Oudh Govt. Press.

Edn. O. 1871b. *Report upon the Progress of Education in the Province of Oudh 1870.* Lucknow: Printed at the Oudh Govt. Press.

Edn. O. 1872. *Report upon the Progress of Education in the Province of Oudh 1871.* Lucknow: Printed at the Oudh Govt. Press.

Edn. O. 1873. *Report upon the Progress of Education in the Province of Oudh 1872.* Lucknow: Printed at the Oudh Govt. Press.

Edn. O. 1874. *Report upon the Progress of Education in the Province of Oudh 1873.* Lucknow: Printed at the Oudh Govt. Press.

Edn. O. 1876. *Report upon the Progress of Education in the Province of Oudh 1875–76.* Lucknow: Printed at the Oudh Govt. Press.

Edn. Pun. 1864a. *Report on Popular Education in the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1860–61* by Capt. A.R. Fuller, DPI, Punjab. Lahore: Published by Authority, MDCCC LXIV.

Edn. Pun. 1874. *Report on Popular Education in the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1873–74* by W.R.M. Holroyd. Lahore: Published by Authority, Printed by W. E Ball, Successor to the Punjab Printing Company.

Edn. NWP. 1874. *North Western Provinces Reports of the Local Education Committees Reports 1873–74* Allahabad: Printed at the North Western Provinces Govt. Press.

Edn. Pun. 1876. *Report on Popular Education in the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1874–75* by W.R.M. Holroyd, DPI. Lahore: Printed by W.E. Ball, Successor to the Punjab Printing Company.

Edn. Pun. 1881. *Report on Popular Education in the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1880–81.* Lahore: Published by W.R.M. Holroyd by W.E. Bell, Successor to the Punjab Printed Company.

Edn. Pun. 1882. *Report on Popular Education in the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1881–82.* Lahore: Publish by Authority, Printed at the Central Jail Press.

Edn. Pun. 1884. *Report on Public Instruction in the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1883–84.* Lahore: The "Civil and Military Gazette" Press.

Edn. Pun. 1889. *Report on Public Instruction in the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1888–89* by W.R.M. Holroyd. Lahore: Published by Authority, Printed at the "Civil and Military Gazette" Press.

Edn. Pun. 1890. *Report on Public Instruction in the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1889–90* by W.R.M. Holroyd. Lahore: Published by Authority, Printed at the "Civil and Military Gazette Press.

Edn. Pun. 1873. *Report on Popular Education in the Punjab and its dependencies for the Year 1872–73.* by C. Pearson Lahore: Published by Authority, Central Jail Press.

Edn. Pun. 1892. *Report on Public Instruction in the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1891–92* by J. Sine. Lahore: Published by Authority, Printed at the "Civil and Military Gazette" Press.

Edn. Pun. 1893. *Report on Public Instruction in the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1892–93* by J. Sine. Lahore: Published by Authority, Printed at the "Civil and Military Gazette" Press.

Edn. Pun. 1895. *Report on Public Instruction in the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1894–95.* Lahore: The "Civil and Military Gazette" Press.

Edn. Pun. 1898. *Report on Public Instruction in the Punjab and its Dependencies for the Year 1897–98* by J. Sine. Lahore: Published by Authority, Printed at the "Civil and Military Gazette" Press.

Edn. Reid. 1852. *Report on Indigenous Education and Vernacular Schools in Agra, Aligarh, Bareli, Etawah, Farrukhabad, Manipur, Mathura and Shahjahanpur 1850/51* by Henry Stewart Reid, Visitor General of Schools NWP. Agra: Printed at the Secundra Orphan Press.

Edn. Reid. 1853. *Report on Indigenous Education and Vernacular Schools in Agra, Aligarh, Bareli, Etawah, Farrukhabad, Manipur, Mathura and Shahjahanpur 1851/52* by Henry Stewart Reid, Visitor General of Schools NWP. Agra: Printed at the Secundra Orphan Press.

Edn. Reid. 1854. *Report on Indigenous Education and Vernacular Schools in Agra, Aligarh, Bareli, Etawah, Farrukhabad, Manipur, Mathura and Shahjahanpur 1853/54* by Henry Stewart Reid, Visitor General of Schools NWP. Agra: Printed at the Secundra Orphan Press.

Edn. UP. 1907. *General Report on Public Instruction in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh for the Year Ending 31st March 1907.* Allahabad: Printed at the United Provinces Government Press.

Edn. UP. 1909. *General Report on Public Instruction in the United Provinces of Agra & Oudh for the year Ending 31st March, 1909.* Allahabad: Printed by the Superintendent, Govt. Press, United Provinces.

Edn. UP. 1911. *General Report on Public Instruction in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh for the Year ending 31st March 1911.* Allahabad: Printed by the Superintendent, Govt. Press, United Provinces.

Edn. UP. 1912. *General Report on Public Instruction in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh for the Year Ending 31st March 1911.* Allahabad: Printed by F-Luker, Superintendent, Govt. Press, United Provinces.

Edn. UP. 1918. *General Report on Public Instruction in the United Provinces of Agra & Oudh for the Quinquennium Ending 31st March 1917.* Allahabad: Printed by the Superintendent, Govt. Press, United Provinces.

Edn. UP. 1919. *General Report on Public Instruction in the United Provinces of Agra & Oudh for the Year Ending 31st March 1919.* Allahabad: Printed by the Superintendent, Govt. Press, United Provinces.

Edn. UP. 1920. *General Report on Public Instruction in the United Provinces of Agra & Oudh for the Year Ending 31st March 1920.* Allahabad: Printed by the Superintendent, Govt. Press, United Provinces.

Edn. UP. 1921. *General Report on Public Instruction in the United Provinces of Agra & Oudh for the Year Ending 31st March 1921.* Allahabad: Printed by the Superintendent, Govt. Press, United Provinces.

Edn. UP. 1923. *General Report on Public Instruction in the United Provinces of Agra & Oudh for the Year Ending 31st March 1923.* Allahabad: Printed by the Superintendent, Govt. Press, United Provinces.

Edn. UP. 1924. *General Report on Public Instruction in the United Provinces of Agra & Oudh for the Year Ending 31st March 1924.* Allahabad: Printed by the Superintendent, Govt. Press, United Provinces.

Edn. UP. 1941. *General Report on Public Instruction in the United Provinces of Agra & Oudh for the Quinquennium Ending 31st March 1940.* Allahabad: Printed by the Superintendent, Govt. Press, United Provinces.

Edn-V. 1853. *Correspondence Relating to Vernacular Education in lower Provinces of Bengal.* 10R/V/23/95 Art 22. Acc No. 11488. NDC, Islamabad.

Film Committee. 1951. *Report of the Film Enquiry Committee.* New Delhi: Manager Govt. of India Press.

Fort William. 1822. 'Letter from Fort William to Maj. General Sir David Ochterlony, Resident in Malwa and Rajpootuna', 5 July. In Sinha, Narendre Krishna and Dasgupta, Arun Kumar (eds.). 1964. *Selections from Ochterlony Papers 1818–1825.* Calcutta: University of Calcutta.

Gallup. 2009. 'Preferred Medium for Communicating with Others Via SMS: GILANI POLL/GALLUP PAKISTAN', report issued on 7 December 2009 by Gallup Pakistan.

GOP. 1988. *Dīnī Madāris kī Jāmē Report* [Urdu. The Comprehensive Report on Religious Seminaries]. Islamabad: Islamic Education Research Cell, Ministry of Education, Govt. of Pakistan.

GOP. 2006. *National Education Census: Highlights.* Islamabad: Ministry of Education & Statistics Division Federal Bureau of Statistics.

GOP. 2009. 'Numbers of Newspapers/Periodicals for the Year, 2009'. Unpublished report compiled by the Audit Bureau of Circulation, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Islamabad.

Grierson, G.A. (ed. & comp). n.d., *Linguistic Survey of India*, Vol. i, Part 1, Reprinted as *Linguistic Survey of Pakistan*, Vol. 1. Lahore: Accurate Printers, n.d.

Grierson, G.A. (ed. & comp). n.d., *Linguistic Survey of India*, Vol. ix, Part 1, Reprinted as *Linguistic Survey of Pakistan*, Vol. 3. Lahore: Accurate Printers, n.d.

Hasnain, Imtiaz. S. 1985. 'Standardization and Modernization of Languages: A Case Study of Urdu'. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.

Hisam, Arif. 2002. '*Urdū Māhir: Ek Ta'āruf*'. In NLA 2002: 47–49.

Jafri, Aqeel Abbas. 2002. '*Urdū Web Sites Kī Dunyā*'. In NLA 2002: 71–74.

Jameel, Ahmad Mirza. 2002. '*Nūrī Nastālīq kī Kahānī Ahmad Mirzā Jameel kī zubānī*'. Interview by Khan, Raziuddin and Siddiqui, Wajih Ahmed. In NLA 2002: 4–13. Originally published in *Science Digest* [Karachi], 1983.

King, Christopher R. 1974. 'The Nagari Pracharini Sabha (Society for the Promotion of the Nagari Script and Language) of Benares 1893–1914: A Study in the Social and Political History of the Hindi Language'. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Wisconsin.

LAD-B. *Legislative Assembly Debates: Bengal.* Dates and page numbers are in the text.

LAD-I. 1949. *Constituent Assembly of India*, Vol. IX; no. 32, Monday, 12–14 Sept 1949, New Delhi: Manager of Publications.

Leitner, G.W. 1882. *History of Indigenous Education in the Punjab Since Annexation and in 1882*. Repr. Lahore: Republican Books, 1991.

Malthus, T.R. 1817. *Statements Respecting the East India College with an Appeal to facts in Refutation of the Charges Lately Brought Against it in the Court of Proprietors*, London: Printed for John Murray, Albemarle St.

Mir, Farina. 2002. 'Social Space of Language: Punjabi Popular Narrative in Colonial India c. 1850–1900'. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Columbia University.

Nizami, Farhan Ahmad. 1983. 'Madrasahs, Scholars and Saints: Muslim Response to the British Presence in Delhi and the Upper Doab 1803–1857'. Unpublished D. Phil Thesis, University of Oxford.

NLA. 2002. *Akhbār-e-Urdū: Urdu Software Number* (Jan–Feb 2002), Islamabad: Muqtadra Qaumi Zaban.

NLA. 2002a. *Akhbār-e-Urdū* (June).

NLA. 2003. *Akhbār-e-Urdū* (June).

NLA. 2009a. *Recommendations for Adoption of Urdu as Official Language*. Islamabad: National Language Authority.

PIPS. 2010. *Understanding the Militants' Media in Pakistan: Outreach and Impact*. Islamabad: Pakistan Institute for Peace Studies.

Public. 1811. *Public Disputation of the Students of the College of Fort William in Bengal before the Rt. Hon. Lord Minto (15 Sept 1810).* Calcutta: Printed, London: Black, Perry & Kingsbury.

Quraishi, S. and Sims-Williams, Ursula. 1978. *Catalogue of the Urdū Manuscripts in the India Office Library*. London: The British Library.

Ram, Divan Anant. 1883. '*Report-ē-Majmuī*' (The collected report), Item No. 158–159. In *Imperial Gazetteer*, Vol. XV (1882–83), p. 182.

Rampur. 1911. *Gazetteer of the Rampur State.* Allahabad: Printed by W.C. Abel, officiating Superintendent, Govt. Press, UP.

Selections NWP. 1856. *Selections from the Records of the Government, North West Provinces Mr. Thamason's Despatches*, Vol. 1. Calcutta: Printed by J. Thomas, at the Baptist Press.

Sharma, G.D. (ed. & comp). 1987. *Vakil Reports Maharajgan* (Hindi/English: The reports of the representatives of the rulers). New Delhi: Radha Krishna Prakashan Pvt (Ltd).

Siddiqi, M. Atique. 1963. *Origins of Modern Hindustani Literature: Source Material*. Aligarh: Naya Kitab Ghar.

Stubbs, Michael (ed.). 1985. *The Other Languages of England: Linguistic Minorities Report.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Taleem. 1854a. *Ishtahār Tā'līm Yenī Government Ishtahār* (Advertisement about Education i.e. Government Advertisement), 10 August. Sikandra: Sahiban-e-Board.

Taleem. 1854b. *Dar Bāb Tā'līm Patvāriān ō Nambardārān* (Advertisement about the education of *patvaris* and *nambardars*), June 1854. Sikandra: Sahiban-e-Board.

Thornton, J. 1846. 'Letter from J. Thornton, Secretary to the NWP Government, to F. Currie, Secretary Govt. of India', 18 November 1846, Agra. In *Selections NWP*, 1856: 332.

SECTION–2

Manuscripts and Letters Etc

Abdullah, Syed. (Trans.) 1239/1863. *Qīāmat Nāmāh* (Doomsday book) [56 pages] Mss. Oriental 14104.f.2 (10). OIOC.

Ali, Khurram. 1822. *Nasīhat ul Muslimīn* (The advice to the Muslims) Oriental Manuscripts. Mss. Urdu 151, OIOC.

Anonymous. 1818. *Masāil-ē-Hindī* (Islamic solutions to problems in Hindi) Oriental Manuscripts. Mss. Urdu f., OIOC.

Anonymous. Circa 18th century. '*Sad Sī Mas'alā*' (103 Islamic solutions to problems) Mss. Oriental. Urdu. 151d, OIOC.

Babar, Zahiruddin. n.d. *Dīvān- ē -Bābar Turkī* Mss. Turki Makhtuta No. 19, RRL.

Bazm, Mir Ashiq Hussain. 1908. *Majmuʿā Hazliāt* (collections of *Hazals*) pp. 120. Mss. No. 1403, RRL.

Bazm, Mir Ashiq Hussain. 1909. *Majmuʿā Hazliāt* pp. 123. Mss. No. 1404, RRL.

Bechaen, Kallan Khan. 1908. *Hazliāt* Mss No. 1401, RRL.

Brayne, F.L. 1945. 'Use of a Common Language for the Indian Army' with several letters from the office of the Adviser of the Welfare General. MSS. Eur.F 152/90 Sept-October 1945, OIOC.

Chirkeen. n.d. *Divan-ē-Chirkīn* (Poetic collection of Chirkeen) Mss. No. 1400, RRL.

Disputation. 1814. Public Disputation at Fort William College. Unprinted Mss. OIOC.

Durant, Mortimer. 1892. "Education of the Nizam's Son, Mir Osman Ali Khan." Letter from Durant to C. Plowden. 02 Feb. IOR. R/2/64.14, OIOC.

Exercises. 1802. Exercises: College of Fort William 1802. Unprinted Mss. OIOC.

Films. 1939. Office of the Commissioner, Rural Reconstruction & Incharge of War Publicity, Punjab, Simla, 12 Sept. 1939 to A.H. Joyce, Information Officer, India Office, Whitehall L/i/1/683, OIOC.

Films. 1940. Films for publicity 1939–40, Secret File 462/14 L/i/1/684, OIOC.

Fort William. 1801. *Fort William College, Calcutta* 1800–1802. 3 volumes Mss. Eur. D. 116, OIOC.

Gopal, Afzal. 1731. '*Terāh Māsā Qutbī* (Nazm)', Mss. 4423, PUL.

Grierson, George. 1885–1933. Grierson collection Mss Eur. E- 223, OIOC.

Hay, Bruce. 1898. 'Letters to his Father' (dates given in the text) IOR: Mss. Eur. F 333/1, OIOC.

Herdfordshire. n.d. *A Preliminary View of the Establishment of the Honourable East-India Company in Hertfordshire of the Honourable East-India Company in*

Hertfordshire for the Education of Young Person Appointed to the Civil Service in India. IOR: J/1/21; J/2/9; J/2/10, OIOC.

Husain, Syed Ali. n.d. *Majmu'ā Hazliāt* pp. 33. Mss. No. 1412, RRL.

Ismail, Muhammad. '*Taqwiyat ul Imān*' (Strengthening of the faith). Mss. Oriental. 14104. f 13, OIOC.

Jang, Nawab Ali Yavar. 1944. Private Secretary to H.E.H. the Nizam to the Resident, Hyderabad State. In a letter to the Secretary to H.E. The Crown Representative, D.O. No. 47-C, 18 January 1944. ACC. 7233. L/P&S/1239, NDC & OIOC.

Jarida. 1885. *Jarida-i-'Ilāmiyya-i Hukm-i Sarkār-i Nizām*. (Gazette of the orders of the Government of the Nizam) 4 vols. 1294 Fasli, No. 14, A A.

MacDonnell, A.P. 1897. 'Letter to Lord Elgin dated 22 August 1897'. Papers of Antony Patrick MacDonnell, 1st Baron MacDonnell of Swinford, 1859–1925. Radcliffe Science Library, Special Collections. Ms. Eng. Hist.c.353, Bod.

MacDonnell, A. P. 1901. 'Minute', Naini Tal, October. Papers of Antony Patrick MacDonnell, 1st Baron MacDonnell of Swinford, 1859–1925. Radcliffe Science Library, Special Collections. Ms. Eng. Hist.c.353, Bod.

Mazhar, Agha Wasi Ali Khan Lakhnawi. n.d. *Maj'muā Hazliat* pp. 94. Mss. No. 1407, RRL.

Radio. 1937. IOR. L/i/l/445 File 223, OIOC.

Radio. 1940. L/PS/8/122/27 Jan 1940. IOR, OIOC.

Radio. 1942. Reports dated 12 May, 07 July, 02 August. L/i/1/962. IOR, OIOC.

Radio. 1949. Letter from C.J. Pennethorne Hughes, Head of Eastern Services, to A.H. Joyce, Commonwealth Relations Office, Whitehall, 17 June'. L/i/1/943, OIOC.

Radio. Ltr. 1940a. Letter from Director AIR Delhi to Controller of Broadcasting, New Delhi', 40/CB/54 of 22 May, OIOC.

Radio. Ltr. 1940b. 'From A.H. Joyce to Sir Malcolm Darling, London, 8 July 1940, India Office, London.' OIOC.

Radio. Note. 1938. 'Note of the Press Conference on Broadcasting held on 01 August 1938, Simla, 02 Aug 1938'. In L/i/1/445, OIOC.

Rafiuddin, Shah. 1821. '*Tanbīh ul Ghafilīn*' (Admonition to the uncaring) Mss. Oriental. Urdu. 157c, OIOC.

Rangin, Sa'adat Yar Khan. n. d. *Masnavī Ma'ā Hazliāt Tasnīf Sa'adat Yār <u>Kh</u>ān Rangīn Dehlavi* (Story in verse along with the *Hazals* written by Saadat Yar Khan. Rangin of Delhi). Oriental MSS Or. 385, OIOC.

Rasa, Hayat Baksh Mustafa Abedi. 1909. *Majmu'ā Hazliāt* pp. 53. Mss No. 1409, RRL.

Resident 1944b. 'H.E.H., the Nizam's Government's "Urdu Medium Instruction Policy". D.O. No. 97-C.ACC No. 7233/L/P&S/1239 dated 18 January 1944, NDC.

Resident. 1944a. Letter from the Resident of Hyderabad to the Secretary of H.E. The Crown Representative, No. 1928. C, 2 October 1944. ACC No. 7223L/P&S/13/1239, NDC.

Sahib-e-Qiran, Syed Imam Ali. c. 1811. *Muntakhab Dīvān Sahib Qir' an* Ms. No. 771 and Oriental Mss. Egerton 1040, Folio 49 Delhi, Persian, OIOC.

Shamim, Syed Jawad Husain Amrohi. 1915. *Maj'muā Hazliāt* pp. 154. Mss. No. 1410, RRL.

Shaw, Alexander. 1942. 'India and the Film', *Cine-Technician* (Feb-Mar), 271–279 [In 10R: L/i/1/691 File 462/14E, OIOC.

Thomason, James. 1847. 'Letter to Wilson', 16 November, Mss. Eur. E 301/10, OIOC.

Waliullah, Syed. *'Qur'ān Majīd'* (The glorious Quran) finished on 9th Jamidi ul Awwal 1243/26 November 1837. Cod. Trubner 25, Hdl.

Younghusband, Francis. 1908. 'Confidential Note on Kashmir Affairs for 1907–1908', Foreign Department, July 1908. IOR: R/1/19/358, OIOC.

SECTION–3

BOOKS AND ARTICLES IN ORIENTAL LANGUAGES

(Only languages other than Urdu and the meanings of the titles are indicated in square brackets)

Abdullah, Syed (ed.). 1951. *Navādir ul Alfāz* [The rarest of words] by Siraj Uddin Arzu. Lahore: Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu.

Abdullah, Syed. 1976. *Pakistan Mẽ Urdū Kā Mas'alā* [The problem of Urdu in Pakistan]. Lahore: Maktaba Khayaban-e-Adab.

Abru, Sirajuddin Shah Mubarak. Circa 18th century. *Dīvān-ē-Ābrū* [The poetic collection of Abru] Mohammad Hasan (ed.). New Delhi: Taraqqi Urdu Bureau, 1990.

Ahmad, Anwar. 1972. *Jammū ō Kashmīr Cultural Akademī kī Urdū Adabī Khidmāt* [The Urdu services of the Jammu and Kashmir Academy]. Delhi: Naz Publishing House.

Ahmad, Hasan Uddin. 1979. "*Jami 'ā 'Usmānia kā Takhai'ul'"* [The idea of Osmania University]. In *Armghān-ē-Jashn-ē-Almas: Jāmi'ā Usmāniā* [The gift of the celebration of Osmania University]. Hyderabad: Majlis-e-Idarat, Armaghan-e-Urdu, 100–109.

Ahmad, Khurshid. 1972. '*Dīnī Adab*' [Religious literature]. In Mahmood, Sayyad Fayyaz (ed.). 1972. *Tārīkh-ē-Adabiāt: Musalmānān-ē-Pākistān-ō-Hind* Vol. 10 *Urdū Adab (1914–1972)* [The History of the Literatures of the Muslims of Pakistan and India]. Lahore: University of the Punjab, pp. 261–376.

Ahmad, Zameer Uddin. 1990. *Khatir-ē-Mā'sūm* [The sensibility of the innocent]. Karachi: Ahsan Matbuat.

Ahmed, Nazir. 2004. *Majmuā' Deputy Nazīr Ahmed: Ibn ul Waqt, Taubat un Nusūh, Bināt un Nāsh, Fasānā-ē-Muttilā, Mirāt ul Urūs, Roeā Sādiqā* [The collection of the novels of Nazir Ahmed]. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications [English translations given in the text. Also see glossary].

Akbarabadi, Nazeer. 1820. *Kulliyat-ē-Nazīr* [the complete poetical works of Nazeer] Lahore: Maktaba Sher-o-Adab, 1951.

Akhtar, Saleem. 1992. '*Muqaddamā*' [preface]. In *Bāgh-ō-Bahār* by Meer Amman (1851 edition), Lahore: Sang-e-Meel, pp. 393–475.

Ali, Fida (Aesh). 1829. *Shō'lā Jawwālā: Majmu'ā' Vāsōkht* [The burning flame: collections of erotic stories in verse]. Lucknow: Naval Kishor.

Ali, Qurban. n.d. *Tōhfat ul Mōminīn* [The gift to the true Muslims]. Lucknow, Neval Kishor.

Amman, Meer. 1851. *Bāgh-ō-Bahār* [The garden and the spring] repr. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel, 1992.

Amrohvi, Ismail. 1694. *Urdū kī Dō Qadīm Masnaviyã* [Two ancient stories in verse in Urdu]. Husain Naqvi (comp.). Lahore: Majlis Taraqqi-e-Adab, 1969.

Ansari, Bayazid. 1570. *Khairul Bayān* [The blessed narrative] [Arabic, Persian, Pashto and Hindi]. In Qasmi 1967; 1–301.

Ansarullah, Mohammad. 1988. *Mo' tamid Daulā Āghā Mir: Islāf ō Ikhlāf* [Aga Mir: ancestors and descendants]. New Delhi: Ghalib Institute.

Aqil, Moinuddin. 2008. *Taehrīk-ē-Āzādī Mē Urdū kā Hissā* [Urdu's rule in the movement for freedom]. Lahore: Majlis-e-Taraqqi-e-Adab.

Arshad, Abdul Rasheed. 1988. *Urdū Bahaēsiat Zariā-ē-Tālīm* [Urdu as a medium of instruction]. Hyderabad: Privately Published.

Arzu, Siraj ud Din Ali Khan. 1751. *Navādir ul-Alfāz: Maē' Gharaib-ul Lughāt 'Abd ul Wāsē' Hānsvī* [The rarest of worlds alongwith the dictionary of unique diction]. Syed Abdullah (ed. & comp.). Karachi: Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu, 1951.

Arzu, Siraj-ud-Din 'Ali Khan. Circa. 18th century. *Muthmir* [Persian: Fruitful]. Khatoon, Rehana (ed.). 1991. *Sirāj-ud-Dīn 'Alī Khān Ārzū Muthmir.* Karachi: The Institute of Central and West Asian Studies, University of Karachi.

Askari, Syed Hasan. 1995. *Ahed-ē-Vastā kī Hindī Adabiāt mẽ Musalmānõ kā Hissā* [The contribution of Muslims to Hindi literature during the medieval period]. Patna: Khuda Baksh Oriental Public Library.

Aslam, Mian Muhammad. 1991. *Urdū kē Qadīm Adalatī Namunē: Dastāvezāt Punjab kī Rōshnī Mẽ* [Ancient samples of court documents of the Punjab in Urdu]. Islamabad: NLA.

Aslam, Mohammad. 1995. *Malfūzātī Adab kī Tarīkhī Aehmiat* [The historical importance of hagiographical literature]. Lahore: Idārā Taehqīqāt-ē-Pakistān.

Avadh, Hari. 2006. *Bhagat Kabīr: Falsafā ō Shaerī* [Saint Kabir: philosophy and poetry]. Lahore: Fiction House.

Azad, Mohammad Hussain. C. 19C *Āb-ē -Hayāt* [The water of life]. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel, 1985.

Azami, Amjad 'Ali n.d *Bahār-i Shariat* [The spring of the Islamic law]. 18 vols. Bareilly: Qadiri Book Depot.

Azfari, Zahiruddin Ali Bakht. 1806. *Wāqi'āt-ē-Azfarī* [Persian: Memoir of Azfari]. Chandrasekharan, T. (ed.). Madras: Government Oriental Manuscripts Library.

Azhar, Shahdad. 1995. *Urdū Ghazal Mē Shāhid Bāzī* [Boy-love in the Urdu ghazal]. Srinagar: Gulshan Publishers

Azhar, Syed Ishtiaq. 1985. *Fakhr-ul 'Ulamā Maulānā Fakhrul Hasan Gangōhī kī Suānēh aor Khidmāt* [The pride of the learned: Maulana Gangohi's biography and services]. Karachi: Meezan-e-Adab.

Babar, Zahiruddin. 1528. *Baburnāmā Vaqāē'* [The events of the life of Babar]. [Turkish] Critical Edition based on four Chaghtay Texts with Introduction and notes by Eiji Mano. Kyoto: Syokado, 1995.

Baloch, Sohail Abbas. 2008. *Urdū Shairī Mē Islāh-ē-Sukhan kī Ravāet* [The Tradition of the correction of verse in Urdu poetry]. Lahore: Majlis-e-Taraqqi-e-Adab.

Barthval, Pitambar. 1942. *Gorakh Bāṇī* [Hindi: The poetry of the Gorakh Nath Poets]. Paryag: Hindi Sahitya Sammelan.

Bedar, Majeed. 1979. "Dārul Tarjumā Jā'miā 'Usmāniā" [Translation Bureau of Osmania University]. In *Armaghān-ē-Jashn-ē-Almās: Ja'miā 'Usmānia.* Hyderabad: Majlis-e-Idārat, Armaghān-e Urdu. 221–28.

Bible. 1860. *Kitāb i-Muqaddas Yā' taurāt, Zabūr, Ambiyā kē Sahifā aur Injīl* [Roman Urdu: the Second Book or the Torah, Psalms of David, the revelations of the Prophets and the New Testament]. London: British and Foreign Bible Society, MDCCCLX.

Bilgrami, Farzand Ahmad Safeer. 1884. *Jalwāh-ē-Khizr* [The sight of the Verdant One]. Arah: Matbu'a Nur ul Anwar.

Bukhari, Khial (ed.). 1958. *Da Divān Ma 'āz Ullāh Khān Mōhmand Musammā ba Āinā Namā* [Pashto/Urdu]: The poetic collection of Maaz Ullah Khan. Peshawar: Pashto Academy, University of Peshawar.

Bukhari, Zulfiqar Ali. 1966. *Sarguzasht* [My life's story]. Karachi: Mu'arif Ltd.

Chand, Sheikh. 1930. "*Maulvi Abdul Haq Sahib kā Maqsad- ē-Zindagī*" [Maulvi Abdul Haq's obective in life]. In Rahman, Syed Mueenur. 1976: 33–34.

Chandpuri, Qiamuddin Qaim. 1755. *Tazkarā Makhzan-ē-Nīkāt* [Persian: Narrative of the treasure of subtleties]. Lahore: Majlis-e-Taraqqi-e-Adab, 1966.

Chishti, Asghar Ali. 1623. *Jawāhir-ē-Farīdī* [The jewels of Farid] [Persian: The Pearls of Farid]. Lahore: Victoria Press, 1884.

Darweeza, Akhund. 1613. *Tazkarā tul Abrār val ashrār* [Pashto/Persian: Narrative of the holy and the evil ones]. Peshawar: Idara-e-Isha'at Sarhad.

Das, Sur. n.d. *Sur Sāgar* [The sea of melody] Translated from Nagri to Urdu by Munshi Natthu Lal. Lucknow: Naval Kishore, 1881.

Dehlavi, Abdul Haq Muhaddis. 1862. *Akhbār ul Akhiār Fil Isrār ul Abrār* [Persian: Compendium of the praiseworthy ones and the secrets of the exalted]. Meerut: Matba' Hashimi.

Dehlavi, Syed Ahmad. 1875. *Hādī-un-Nisā* [The expert guide for women]. Lahore: Majlis-e-Taraqqi-e-Urdu.

Durrani, Atash. 1993. *Urdū Istilāhāt Sāzi* [Neologism in Urdu]. Islamabad: Anjuman Sharaia Ilmia.

Faridkoti, Ainul Haq. 1972. *Urdū Zubān kī Qadīm Tārīkh* [The ancient history of the Urdu language]. Lahore: Orient Research Centre.

Farishta, Mohammad Qasim. Circa 1612. *Tārīkh-ē-Farishtā* [Persian: The History of Farishta] Vols. 1&2. Lucknow: Naval Kishore, 1864-65.

Farooqi, K.A. n.d *Urdū Mẽ Wahabī Adab* [Wahabi literature in Urdu]. Delhi: Dept of Urdu, Delhi University.

Faruqi, Shams ur Rahman. 1999. *Urdū kā Ibtidāi Zamānā: Adabī Taēhzīb Aur Tarīkh kē Paēhlū* [The initial period of Urdu: Some aspects of the literature and history of Urdu]. Karachi: Aaj Publications.

Fatehpuri, Farman. 1977. *Urdū-Hindī Tanāzā'* [Urdu-Hindi controversy]. Islamabad: Qaumi Committee Barae Sadsala Taqribat Paidaesh-e-Quaid-e-Azam.

Fazl, Abul. 1590. *Ain-e-Akbari* [The regulation of Akbar] Vol. 3 [Persian]. Lucknow: Matba'a Naval Kishore, 1881.

Fazl, Abul. 1595. *Akbar Nāmā* [The narrative about Akbar] Vol. 2 Trans. into English by Beveridge, 1902. Lahore: Book Traders, n.d.

Fazli, Fazal Ali. 1748. *Karbal Kathā* [The story of Karbala]. Malik Ram (comp. and ed.). Patna: Idara-e-Taehqiqat-e-Urdu, 1965.

Ghaznavi, Khatir. 2003. *Urdū Zubān kā MaāKhiz Hindko* [The root of Urdu—Hindko]. Islamabad: NLA.

Gilani, Syed Manazir Ahsan. 1954. *Suānēh Qāsimī Yenī Sīrat Shams ul Islām Syednā al-Imām ul-Kabīr Hazrat Maulānā Mohammad Qāsim ul-Nānautvī Qadas Sarāh* 2 Vols. 1 [The life of the sun of Islam the exalted and great religious leader Mohammad Qasim of Nanauta]. Published by Darul Ulum Deoband. Lahore: Maktaba Rahmania.

Haider, Nazar Sajjad. 1911. *Akhtar un Nisā Bēgum.* Qurratul Ain Hyder (ed.). Delhi: Educational Publishing House, 2004.

Hali, Altaf Husain. 1879. *'Mad-ō-Jazr-ē-Islām'* [The rise and fall of Islam] in *Kulliyāt-ē-Nazm-ē-Halī* [The collected poetry of Hali] Iftikhar Ahmad Siddiqui (ed.). Lahore: Majlis-e-Taraqqi-e-Adab, 1970. pp. 57–176.

Hali, Altaf Husain. 1893. *Muqaddamāh-ē-Shē'r-ō-Shā'irī* [Introduction to poetry and poetics]. Lahore: Kashmir Kitab Ghar, 1971.

Haq, Abdul. 1933. *Marhatī Zubān Par Fārsī kā Asar* [The influence of Persian on Marathi]. Aurangabad, Deccan: Anjuman Taraqqi Urdu. First published in *Urdū Magazine* [Aligarh] in April 1921.

Haq, Abdul. 1939. *Urdū kī Ibtidāī Nash-ō-Numā Mẽ Sūfiā-ē-Karām kā Hissā* [The contribution of the mystics to the development and growth of Urdu]. Delhi: Anjuman Taraqqi-e- Urdu.

Haq, Abdul. 1959. *Chand Ham Asar* [Some contemporaries] enlarged & revised ed. Karachi: Urdu Academy Sindh, 2000.

Haq, Abdul. 1961. *Qadīm Urdū* [Old Urdu]. Karachi: Anjuman Tarqqi Urdu.

Haq, Abdul. nd. (b). *Pakistān Mẽ Urdū kā Almiyā* [The tragedy of Urdu in Pakistan]. Karachi: Anjuman Taraqqī-ē-Urdū

Hashmi, Naseeruddin. 1923. *Dakan Mẽ Urdū.* [Urdu in the Deccan] 6th revised edition. Lucknow: Naseem Book Depot, 1963.

Hashmi, Naseeruddin. 1963. *Dakanī Culture* [The culture of Deccan]. Lahore: Majlis-e-Taraqqi-e-Adab.

Hashmi, Nurul Hasan. 1958. '*Muqadamā*' [Introduction]. In Taehsin 1775: 21–49.

Hatim, Shaikh Zahūr Uddin. 1756. '*Dībāchā*' [Persian: preface]. In Zulfiqar 1975: 39–40.

Hatim, Shaikh Zuhur Uddin. 1756. *Dīvān Zādāh* [The smaller poetic collection]. Edited and introduced by Ghulam Hussain Zulfiqar. Lahore: Marktaba Khyaban-e-Adab, 1975.

Hussaini, Syed Mohammad Akbar. 1401. *Jawāmē'ul Kalam* [Universities of the Word] Trans. from Persian into Urdu by Mu'īnuddīn Dardāi'. Karachi: Nafees Academy, 1980.

Hyder, Qurrat ul'ain. 1976. *Dilrubā* [The stealer of hearts]. Lahore: Rabiah Book House.

Ikram, Sheikh Mohammad. 1971. *Yādgār-ē-Shiblī* [Memoir of Shibli]. Lahore: Idara Saqafat-e-Islamia.

Imami, Mohammad Imam. 1930. "*Mujāhid- ē-Urdū*" [The Champion of Urdu]. In Rahman, Syed Mueenur. 1976: 133.

Insha, Insha Allah Khan. 1802. *Daryā-ē-Latāfat* [The sea of subtleties] [Persian]. Introduced by Maulvi Abdul Haq. Aurangabad: Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu, 1916.

Insha, Insha Allah Khan. Circa 1803. *Kahānī Ranī Kētkī aōr kunwar Ūdē Bhān kī* [The story of Queen Ketki and Prince Ude Bhan]. Karachi: Anjuman Taraqqi Urdu, 1st ed., 1933. This ed. 2003.

Islahi, Abu Sa'ad. 2004. '*Arabī Zubān-ō-Adab Mẽ Rōhilkhand kā Hissā* [The contribution of Rohilkhand in Arabic language and literature]. Rampur: Rampur Raza Library.

Ismail, Mohammad. 1876. *Taqwiat ul Īmān* [The strengthening of the faith] Trans. From Persian to Urdu by Mohammad Sultan Khan. Lucknow: Naval Kishore.

Ismail, Mohammad. 1901. *Sirāt-ē-Mustaqīm* [The straight path] Trans from Persian to Urdu. Lahore: Matb'*ā-ē*-Ahmadi.

Ismail, Mohammad. n.d. *Sīlk Nūr Masnavī* [on the margins of *Tafsīr Sura' Taēhrīm*] in OIOC. Place missing: Matb'ā-ē-K̲h̲alīlī.

Jafer, Sayeda and Jain, Gian Chand. 1998. *Tari̲k̲h Adab Urdū 1700 tak* 5 vols [History of Urdu literature till 1700]. New Delhi: Qaumi Council Baraē Forogh Urdu Zuban.

Jah, Muhammad Hussain. 1908–1915. *Talism-ē-Hōsh Rubā.* [The magic which berefts one of reason]. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel.

Jain, Gian Chand. 2005. *Ēk Bhāshā: Dō Likhāwat, Dō Adab* [One language: two scripts, two literary traditions]. Delhi: Educational Publishing House.

Jalili, Aba Sa'adat. 2002. *Lallūjī Lāl Kavī: Ēk Adabī Suānēh* [Lalluji Lal Poet: A literary biography]. Lahore: Majlis-e-Taraqqi-i-Adab.

Jalibi, Jamil (comp. and ed.). 1973. *Masnavī Kadam Rāō Padam Rāō* by Fakhar Din Nizami. Delhi: Educational Publishing House.

Jalibi, Jamil (comp. & ed.). 1973a. *Qadīm Urdū kī Lughat* [The dictionary of old Urdu]. Lahore: Markazi Urdu Board.

Jalibi, Jamil. 1975. *Tarīkh-ē-Adab-ē-Urdū* [History of Urdu literature] Vol. 1. Lahore: Majlis-e-Tarqqi-e-Adab.

Jalibi, Jamil. 1987. *Tarīkh-ē-Adab-ē-Urdū* Vol. 2. Lahore: Majlis Tarriqi-e-Adab.

Jang, Mirza Beg Sarwar. 1933. *Kārnāmā-ē-Sarwarī: Suāneh-ē-Khud Navisht* (The great deed of Sarwar: autobiography). Aligarh: Aligarh University Press.

Javed, Yunus (comp. & ed.). 1987. '*Harf-ē-Awwal*' in *Kulliyāt-ē-Nāsikh* ['Foreword' in The collected works of Nasikh] Vol. 1. Lahore: Majlis-e-Taraqqi-e-Adab.

Kaefvi, Kaefi. 1979. *Kashmīr Mẽ Urdū* [Urdu in Kashmir]. Lahore: Markazi Urdu Board.

Kamal, Syed Mustafa. 1990. *Hyderabad Mẽ Urdū Kī Taraqqī: Tā'līmī aur Sarkārī Zubān kī Haisiyat sē* [The progress of Urdu in Hyderabad as an official and educational language]. Hyderabad: Shaqufa Publications.

Kamboh, Mohammad Saleh. 1659–1660. *Shāh Jahã Nāmā* [History Shah Jahan] Vol. 2. Lahore: Majlis-e-Taraqqi-e-Adab, 1958.

Kamran, Jilani. 1992. *Qaōmiāt Kī Tashkīl aōr Urdū Zubān* [The role of the Urdu language in the creation of nationalism]. Islamabad NLA.

Karnahi, Karimullah Qureshi. 2007. *Pahāṛī aōr Urdū: Ēk Taqābalī Ja'ezā* [Pahari and Urdu: A comparative survey] Islamabad: NLA.

Kashmiri, Akbar Haider (Comp) 2004. *Hindū Marsīyā Gō Shu'arā* [Hindu elegiac poets]. New Delhi: Shahid Publications.

Kausar, Inam ul Haq. 1986a. *Balōchistān Mẽ Urdū kī Qadīm Daftarī Dastāvēzāt* [Old documents of Urdu in Baluchistan]. Islamabad: NLA.

Kausar, Inam ul Haq. 1986b. *Balochistan Mẽ Urdū* [Urdu in Baluchistan]. Islamabad: NLA, 1994 repr. ed..

Kazmi, Tamkin. 1930. *Tazkarā-ē- Rēkhtī* [Narrative of Rekhti poetry]. Hyderabad: n.p.

Khairi, Rashidul. 1936. *Majmū'ā Rāshidul Khairī* [The collected works of Khairi]. Raziqul Khairi (comp.). New Delhi: Farid Book Depot, 2005.

Khaliq, Abdul. 1873. *Shari'at kā Lath* [The stick of the Islamic Law]. Bombay: Matb'a Haideri.

Khan, Abdul Rasheed. 2002. *Urdū Afsānē Mẽ Jinsī Jazbāt* [Sexual emotions in the Urdu short story]. Srinagar: Gulshan Publishers.

Khan, Ahmad. 1987. *Qur'ān Karīm Kē Urdū Tarājim: Kitābiāt* [The translations of the Benevolent Quran in Urdu: books]. Islamabad: NLA.

Khan, Ali Mohammad. 1889. *Mirā 'at-ē-Ahmadī* 3 Vols in one cover separately numbered [Persian: The Mirror of Ahmad]. Bombay: Matba'a-e-Fatah-ul-Kareem.

Khan, Ali Mohammad. 1928. *Mirā'at-ē-Ahmadī* 2 Vols. Syed Nawab Ali (ed.). Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.

Khan, Dargah Quli. Circa 18th century. *Muraqqa-i Dillī.* Persian with Urdu translation [The album of Delhi]. Khaliq Anjum (ed. and trans.). New Delhi: Anjuman Taraqqi Urdu, 1993.

Khan, Ghulam Jilani. 1989. *Pāk Fauj Mẽ Nifaz-ē-Urdū* [The imposition of Urdu in the Pakistan Army]. Islamabad: Muqtadra Qaumi Zuban.

Khan, Ghulam Mustafa. 1985. *Hamārā 'Ilm-ō-Adab* [Our knowledge and literature]. Hyderabad, Sindh: Al-Mustafa Ilmi Markaz.

Khan, Masood Hussain. 1966. *Tarīkh Zubān Urdū* [A History of the Urdu language]. Lahore: Urdu Markaz.

Khan, Masud Husain and Khan, Ghulam Omer (eds.) 1969. *Classical Dakanī Urdū Dictionary.* Hyderabad: Andhru Pradesh Sahitiya Academy.

Khan, Rashid Hasan (ed. & comp.). 2003. *Zatal Nāmā: Kulliyāt-ē-Jā'afar Zatallī* [Frivolous writings: The collected works of Jafar Zatalli]. New Delhi: Published by the compiler.

Khan, Rashid Hasan (ed. & introduction). 1996. *Intikhab-ē-Kalām-ē-Nāsikh* [Selections from the poetry of Nasikh]. Karachi: Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu.

Khan, Syed Ahmed. 1847. *Āsār us Sanādīd* [The remains of the great people]. Aligarh: Aligarh Muslim University, 2007.

Khatoon, Rehana (ed.). 1991. 'Preface' of *Muthmir* [Fruitful]. 1991: 1–68.

Khatoon, Rehana (ed, & introduction). 1991. *Sirāj-ud-Din 'Alī Khan Arzū: Muthmir* [fruitful]. Karachi: The Institute of Central and West Asian Studies, University of Karachi.

Khaveshgi, Abdullah Khan. 1937. *Farhang-ē-'Amirā* [The dictionary replete with riches]. Islamabad: NLA, 2007.

Khiyal, Naseer Husain. 1916. *Dāstān-ē-Urdū* [The story of Urdu]. Hyderabad, Deccan: Idārā-ē-Ishā'at-ē-Urdū.

Khusrau, Amir. 1293. *Dībāchā Dīvān-ē-Ghurratul Kamāl* [Preface to the poetic collection 'The acmi of perfection'] Syed Wazir ul Hasan Abidi (ed.). Islamabad: National Committeee for the 700th celebrations of Amir Khusrau. Islamabad: National Book Foundation, 1975.

Khusrau, Amir. 1318. *The Nuh Sipihr of Amīr Khusrau* [The nine skies of Amir Khusrau]. Mirza, Mohammad Wahid (ed). Calcutta: Published for the Islamic Research Associations by the Oxford University Press, 1946.

Kirmani, Syed Mohammad Mubarak. Circa 14th century. *Siyārul Auliyā: dar aēhwāl ō malfūzāt-e-Mashaikh-e-Chisht* [Persian: Lives of the saints—about the lives and conversations of the Chishti saints]. Lahore: Markaz-ē-Taehqīqāt-ē-Fārsī Irān-ō-Pakistan, 1978.

Lakhnavi, Sahba. 1981. *Afkār: Bartāniā Mẽ Urdū* [Reflections: Urdu in Britain]. Karachi: Maktaba Afkar.

Lahori, Abdul Hameed.c.1640s. *Bādshāh Nāmā* [Persian: Chronicle of the King] Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1868.

Lal, Joamal Waiz. 1920. *Urdū Zubān kī Tārīkh* [The history of the Urdu language]. Delhi: Matba'a Mujtabai.

Ludhianwi, Muhammad Yusuf. 1995. *Ikhtilāf-ē-Ummat aōr Sīrat-ē-Mustaqīm* [Differences between the community and the straight path]. Karachi: Maktaba Ludhianwi.

Malik et al. 2006. *Pakistan Mẽ Urdū* [Urdu in Pakistan] 5 vols. As given below:

Malik, Fateh Mohammad. 2006. *'Punjāb kī Mādrī Zubān Urdū Haē'* [The mother tongue of the Punjab is Urdu]. In Malik et al. Vol. 4: 1–5.

Malik, Fateh Muhammad, Sardar Ahmad Pirzada and Tajammal Shah (eds.). 2006. *Pakistān Mẽ Urdū: Vol. 1, Sindh; Vol. 2, Baluchistān; Vol. 3, Abāsīn; Vol. 4 Punjāb; Vol. 5, Kashmīr.* Islamabad: NLA.

Malik, Fateh Muhammad, Syed Sardar Ahmad Pirzada and Tajamal Shah (comp). 2006. *Pakistan Mẽ Urdū*: *Sindh* Vol. 1. Islamabad: NLA.

Malik, Fateh Muhammad, Syed Sardar Ahmad Pirzada and Tajamal Shah (comp). 2006. *Pakistan Mẽ Urdū*: Balochistan Vol. 2. Islamabad: NLA.

Malik, Fateh Muhammad, Syed Sardar Ahmad Pirzada and Tajamal Shah (comp). 2006. *Pakistān Mẽ Urdū*: *Abasīn (Sarhad + Shumālī Elāqā Jāt)* Vol. 3. Islamabad: NLA.

Manjhu, Sikandar Ibn Mohammad. 1890. *Mirāt-ē-Sikandarī* [Persian] [The mirror of Alexander]. Bombay: Matba'a Fatah-ul-Karim.

Mir, Mir Taqi. 1755. *Nikāt ul Shu 'arā* [Persian: subtleties of poets]. Abdul Haq (comp.). Karachi: Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu.

Mohammad, Din. n.d. *Tafsīr Qur'ān Majīd Bazubān-ē-Hindi* [The exegesis of the glorious Quran in the Hindi language]. Lahore: Matba'a Siddiqui.

Mohsin, Mohsin Ali. 1861. *Tazkarā-ē-Sarāpā Sukhan* [The narrative of the (female) body in verse]. No publication details.

Mughal, Shaukat. 1990. *Urdū mẽ Siraikī Zubān kē Anmit Nukūsh* [The indelible signs of the Siraiki language in Urdu]. Multan: Siraiki Isha'ati Idara.

Mukhlis, Ali Mohammad. Circa 17th century. *Dā 'Alī Mohammad Mukhlis Dīvān* [The poetic collection of Ali...]. Pervez Māhjoor Khawēshkī (ed. & comp.). Peshawar: Pashto Academy, University of Peshawar, n.d.

Mushafi, Ghulam Hamadani. 1861. *Tazkarā-ē-Hindī* [Biographies of the poets of Hindi]. Abdul Haq (ed.). Delhi: Jamia Barqi Pres, 1933.

Mushir, Khalil Ullah Ahmad Siddiqui. 1974. *Rēkthī kā Tanqīdī Mutā 'elā* [The critical study of Rekhti]. Lucknow: Naseem Book Depot.

Mushtaqi, Sheikh Rizqullah. 1572. *Wāqiāt-ē-Mushtāqī* [Persian: The incidents of Mushtaq]. Edited by Iqtidar Husain Siddiqui and Waqarul Hasan Siddiqui. Rampur: Rampur Raza Library, 2002.

Mustafa, Ghulam Mohammad. 1990. *Musalmānān-ē-Sahāranpur aōr Taēhrik Dārul 'Ulūm Deoband* [The Muslims of Saharanpur and the Movement of the Darul Ulum at Deoband]. Karachi: South Asian Publishers.

Nadvi, Muinuddin Ahmad. 1986. *Hayāt-ē-Sulaimān* [The life of Sulaiman]. Lahore: National Book House.

Nadvi, Rasheed Akhtar. 1995. *Pakistan kā Qadīm Rasmul Khat aōr Zubān* [The ancient script and language of Pakistan]. Islamabad: National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research.

Nadvi, Syed Sulaiman. 1939. *Nuqūsh-ē-Sulaimānī* [The marks of Sulaiman]. Karachi: Kaleem Press. Repr. Revised ed. 1951.

Nadvi, Syed Sulaiman. 1968. *Maqālāt-ē-Sulaimān* [The dissertations of Sulaiman] Vol. 2. Shah Moinuddin Nadvi (comp & ed.). Azamgarh: Darul Musannifin.

Nami, 'Abdul 'Alim. 1962–1973. *Urdū Thītar* [Urdu theatre] 4 Vols. Karachi: Anjuman-e-Taraqqi-e-Urdu.

Naqvi, Jamil. 1992. *Urdū Tafāsīr* [Exegeses of the Qur'an in Urdu]. Islamabad: Muqtadra Qaumi Zaban.

Narang, Gopi Chand. 1987. *Amīr Khusrau kā Hindvī kalām Maē' Nuskhā-ē-Berlin Zakhīrā Sprenger* [Amir Khusrau's Hindvi poetry along with the Berlin copy of the Mss in the Sprenger Collection]. Lahore: Sang-e-Meel, 1990.

Naseem, Hameed. 1990. *Nāmumkin kī Justujū* [In the quest of the impossible]. Karachi: Fazli Sons.

Nisa, Rasheed Un. 1894. *Islāh un Nisā* [The reform of women]. Patna: Khuda Baksh Oriental Public Library, 2007.

NLA. 2006. *Daftarī Istilahāt: English-Urdu* [Official terminology]. Islamabad: NLA.

Pal, Jamil Ahmad. 1993. *Punjābī Klāsikī Lughat* [The classical dictionary of Punjabi]. Lahore: Punjabi Science Board.

Qadri, Khalid Hasan. 2004. '*Matrūkāt kī Lughat*', [Dictionary of obsolete words]. 3 Vols. *Jarida* Nos. 25, 26 &28.

Qadri, Mohammad Ayub. 1988. *Urdū Nasr Kē Irtiqā Mẽ 'Ulamā kā Hissā* [The contribution of the learned scholars of Islam in the evolution of Urdu prose]. Lahore: Idara-e-Saqafat Islamia.

Qalandar, Hamid. Circa 14th century. *Khair ul Majālis* [The most blessed of the Assemblies]. Edited and introduced by Khaleeq Ahmad Nizami. Aligarh: Dept. of History, Muslim University, Aligarh.

Qasmi, Abdul Quddus (ed.). 1967. *Khairul Bayān* [The blessed narrative]. Peshawar: Pashto Academy.

Qasmi, Shareef Husain and Mazhar, Mohammad Saleem. 2001. 'Arzu, Sirajuddin Ali Khan'. In *Danishnāmēh: Zubān-ō-Adab-ē-Fārsī dar Shabā Qārā* [Persian: Encyclopedia of the Persian Language and Literature in the Subcontinent] Vol. 1. Tehran: Farhangistan-e-Zuban-o-Adab.

Qidvai, Siddiq Ur Rahman (comp. & ed.). 1987. *Dēhlī kē Iskūlõ Mẽ Urdū Nisāb kē Masāel* [The problems of the syllabi of Urdu in the schools of Delhi]. Delhi: Urdu Academy.

Qureshi, Masood. 1987. *Rahnumā Nashriāt Radio* [Guide for Broadcasting on the Radio]. Lahore: Urdu Science Board.

Qureshi, Waheed. 1966. 'Introduction'. *Mansaviāt-ē-Hasan Vol. 1* [Hasan's stories in verse]. Waheed Qureshi (ed. & comp.). Lahore: Majlis-e-Taraqqi-e-Adab.

Rahman, Syed Mansoor. 1976. Bābā-ē-Urdu: *Aehvāl-ō-Afkār* [The Father of Urdu: Life and Thought.] Lahore: Sang-e-Meel.

Ruknuddin, Mohammad (comp.). 1928. *Maqābis-ul Majālis: Ishārāt-ē-Farīdī* [Persian: The dominant assembly: signs of Farid]. Lahore: Matba 'ā Rafīq-ē-Ām.

Rumi, Jalaluddin. Circa 13th century. *Masnavī Maulvī Mā'navī* 6 Vols. Original Persian with Urdu Translation by Qazi Sajjad Hussain. Lahore: Al-Faisal Nashran, 2006.

Rusva, Mirza Hadi. 1899. *Umraō Jān Adā.* Lahore: Ishrat Publishing, House.

Rusva, Mirza Hadi. 1928. *Muraqqā-i Lailā Majnū* [The album of Laila and Majnun]. Lahore: Majlis Taraqqi-e-Adab, 1963.

Rusva, Mirza Hadi. n.d. *Sharīf Zādā* [The son of a gentlemen]. Lahore: Kitab Ghar.

Sabir, Ayub. 1993. *Urdū kī Ibtidā kē Bārē Mē Mohaqqīqīn kē Nazariāt* [The views of researchers about the birth of Urdu]. Abbottabad: Sarhad Urdu Academy.

Sabzwari, Shaukat n.d. *Urdū Zubān Kā Irtiqā* [the evolution of the Urdu Language]. Karachi: Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu.

Sadeed, Anwar. 1985. *Urdū Adab kī Taehrīkē* [The movements of Urdu literature]. Karachi: Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu.

Saleem, Waheed Uddin. 1921. *Vaz'ē Islāhāt* [The creation of neologism]. Karachi: Anjuman Taraqqi Urdu, 1994.

Saleem, Waheeduddin. Circa 20th century. '*Hindustān kī 'am Zubān'*. In *Ifādiāt-ē-Salīm* [The common language of India]. Mohammad Sardar Ali (comp.). Hyderabad: Kutab Khana Masjid Chowk.

Sambhli, Murad Ullah Ansari. 1875. *K̲h̲udā kī Nē'mat al ma'rūf Tafsīr-ē-Murādiā* [The blessing of God popularly known as the exegesis of Murad]. Bombay: Matba'a Haideri.

Sanati. 1645. *Qissā Bēnazīr* [The story of Benazir]. Abdul Qadir Sarwari Yusufia (comp.). Silsila, No. 40. 1938.

Sarwari, Abdul Qadir. 1930. Untitled Opinion of Abdul Haq. In Rahman, Syed Mueenur 1976: 158.

Sarwari, Abdul Qadir. 1934. *Hyderabād Dakan kī Tā' līmī Taraqqī Guzishtā Rubā Sadī Mē* (The progress of education in Hyderabad during the last quarter century). Hyderabad, Deccan: Azam Steam Press.

Sarwari, Abdul Qadir. 1993. *Kashmīr Mē Urdū* [Urdu in Kashmir] 3 volumes. Published between 1982–1993. Srinagar: Jammu and Kashmir Academy of Art, Culture, and Languages.

Sarwari, Abdul Qadir. 1998. *Kulliyāt-ē Sirāj* [The complete works of Siraj]. Delhi: Qaumi Council Barai Farogh-i Urdu Zuban.

Shah, Gul Hasan. 1884. *Tazkarā-ē-G̲h̲ausiā* [The narrative of Ghaus]. Lahore: Khazeena Ilm-o-Adab, 2000.

Shahab, Masood Hasan. 1992. *Bahāwalpur Mē Urdū kī Qadīm Daftarī Dastāwēzāt* [Old official documents of Urdu in Bahawalpur]. Islamabad: NLA.

Shakespear, John. 1840. *Muntak̲h̲abāt-i-Hindī or Selections in Hindustani* vol. 1. 4th ed. London: Printed for the Author.

Sharar, Abdul Haleem. 1927. *Guzishtā Lucknow: Hindustān Mẽ Mashriqī Tamaddun Kā Akhrī Namūnā* [Lucknow of the past: The last remnant of Eastern civilization in India]. M. Ikram Chughtai (ed. & comp.) Lahore: Sang-i-Meel Publications, 2006.

Shareef, Mohammad Jamal. 2004. *Dakan Mẽ Urdū Sha'irī Valī Sē Paehlē* [Urdu poetry in the Deccan before Vali]. Hyderabad, India: Idara Adabiat Urdu.

Shauq, Nawab Mirza. Circa 19th century. *Masnaviāt-ē-Shauq* (ed.). [The verse stories of Shauq]. Tabassum, Israr Ahmed. Lahore: Takhliq Markaz, n.d.

Shirani, Hafiz Mahmud. 1926. '*Rēkhtā*', *Oriental College Magazine* (May). In 1965: 1–9.

Shirani, Hafiz Mahmud. 1928. *Punjāb Mẽ Urdū* [Urdu in the Punjab] Reprinted. Islamabad: NLA, 1988.

Shirani, Hafiz Mahmud. 1930 & 31. '*Gujri ya Gujrati Urdu Daswẽ Sadī Hijrī Mẽ: Oriental College Magazine* [Gujri or Gujrati in the 10th century Hijri] (Nov. 1930 & Feb. 1931). In Shirani 1965: 159–200.

Shirani, Hafiz Mahmud. 1930. '*Urdū kē Fiqrē aur Dōhrē Navẽ Sadī Hijrī kī fārsī Tasnīfāt Sē*'. *Oriental College Magazine* [Urdu sentences and couplets in the 9th century Hijri in Persian writings] (August). In Shirani 1965: 132–158.

Shirani, Hafiz Mahmud. 1940. '*Dae'rā Kē Mehdviõ Kā Urdū Adab Kī Tā'mīr Mẽ Hissā*', [The contribution of the Mehdvis to the development of Urdu]. *Oriental College Magazine* (Nov. 1940–Feb. 1941). In Shirani 1987: 146–242.

Shirani, Hafiz Mahmud. 1941. '*Urdu-ē-Qadīm kē Mutā'liq Chand Tasrīhāt*', *Oriental College Magazine* [Some explanation about old Urdu] (May). In Shirani 1965: 45–53.

Shirani, Hafiz Mahmud. 1965. *Maqālāt-ē-Hāfiz Mahmūd Shīrānī* [The dissertations of Shirani]. Vol. 1. Muzaffar Mahmud Shirani (ed. and comp). Lahore: Majlis-e-Taraqqi-e-Adab.

Shirani, Hafiz Mahmud. 1987. *Maqālāt-ē-Hāfiz Mahmūd Shīrānī* Vol. 2. M.M. Shirani (ed. and comp.). Lahore: Majlis-e-Taraqqi-e-Adab.

Siddiqi, Atiq (Comp). 1966. *Atthārā Saō Sattāvan: Akhbār aōr Dastāvēzẽ* [1857: newspapers and documents]. Delhi: Maktaba Shahab.

Siddiqi, Kamal Ahmad. 1998. *Urdū Radio Aōr Television Mẽ Tarsīl-ō-Iblāgh kī Zubān* [Urdu as the language of communication in the radio and TV]. New Delhi: National Council for the Promotion of Urdu

Siddiqi, M. Atique. 1979. *Gilchrist aōr us Kā Ahed* [Gilchrist and his age] 1st ed. circa 1960s. Delhi: Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu (Hind). Rev. ed., 1979.

Siddiqui, Abu Lais. 1967. *Lucknau kā Dabistān-ē-Shā'irī* [Lucknow's garden of poetry]. Lahore: Urdu Markaz.

Siddiqui, Muhammad Naeem. 1986. *Allāmā Syed Sulaimān Nadvī: Shakhsiyat ō Adabī Khidmat* [The most learned Nadvi: Personality and literary contribution]. Karachi: Majlis Nashriat-e-Islam.

Sijzi, Amir Hasan Ala. 1322. *Fawāēd ul Fawād* [Persian-Urdu: Benefits of the hearts]. Trans. into Urdu by Khwaja Hasan Sani Nizami. Delhi: Urdu Academy, 1992.

Snatak, Vijendra. 1999. *Hindī Sahityā kā Itihās* [The history of Hindi literature] Trans into Urdu by Khurshid Alam as *Hindī Adab kī Tarī<u>kh</u>.* New Delhi: Sahitya Academy.

Taehsin, Mir Mohammad Khan. 1775. *Naō Tarz-ē-Murass'ā* [A new and embellished style]. Comp. & ed. Hashmi, Syed Nurul Hasan. Allahabad: Hindustani Academy, UP.

Thanvi, Ashraf Ali. n.d. *Bahishtī Zēvar* [The ornaments of paradise]. Karachi: Kutub Khana Ashrafia, n.d.

Uddin, Ikram. 1890–91. *Tōhfatul Islām: Tafsīr Sūrā' Fātehā* [The gift of Islam: Exegesis of the verse of Fatiha] Lahore: Siddiqui Press.

Ullah, Sami. 1988. *Unnīsvĩ Sadī Mẽ Urdū kē Tasnīfī Idārē* [Institutions for publication in the 19th century]. Faizabad: Privately Published.

Usmani, Muhammad Rafi. 1997. *Europe kē Tīn Mu 'āshī Nizām* [Three economic systems of Europe]. Karachi: Idra-ul-Muarif.

Wajhi, Mulla. 1635. *Sab Ras* [All nectar], (comp. & ed.) Abd al Haq. Karachi: Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu.

Yusuf, Muhammad. 1968. *Maulānā Maudūdī Par 'Aitrāzāt Kā 'Ilmī Jaizā* [A scholarly survey of objections to Maududi]. Lahore: Islamic Publications Ltd.

Zor, Mohiuddin Qadri. 1934. *Ahed-ē-'Usmānī Mẽ Urdū Kī Taraqqī* (The development of Urdu during the reign of Osman). Hyderabad, Deccan: Azam Steam Press.

Zulfiqar, Ghulam Hussain (comp. & ed.). 1975. *Dīvān Zādāh.* Lahore: Maktaba Khiaban-e-Adab.

Zulfiqar, Ghulam Hussain. 1975. '*Harf-ē-A<u>gh</u>āz*' [Foreword]. In *Dīvān Zādāh: Tālīf Shei<u>kh</u> Zuhūr Uddīn Hātim* [The little poetic collection: compiled by...], 1–40.

SECTION–4

Books and Articles in Western Languages

(Only languages other than English are indicated in brackets)

Ahmad, Nihal. 2005. *A History of Radio Pakistan.* Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Ahmad, Qeyamuddin. 1966. *The Wahabi Movement in India.* New Delhi: Manohar Publishers. Second revised edition, 1994.

Ahmad, Rafiuddin. 1891. 'Kaisar-e-Hind and Hindustani', *Nineteenth Century.* Vol. 29: No. 171: 747–753.

Ahmad, Rafiuddin. 1892. 'The Queen's Hindustani Diary', *Strand.* Vol. 4 (July–Dec), 550–557.

Ahmad, Sadaf. 2009. *Transforming Faith: The Story of Al-Huda and Islamic Revivalism among Urban Pakistani Women.* New York: Syracuse University Press.

Ahmed, Khalid. 1998. 'Good Ink for Bad Blood'. *Himal* ii; 8 (August): 42–4.

Alavi, Hamza. 1987. 'Politics of Ethnicity in India and Pakistan'. In Alavi, H. & Harriss, John (eds.). 1989. *Sociology of Developing Societies.* London: Macmillan Education Ltd., pp. 222–246.

Alim, Tayka S. 1993. *Arabic, Arwi and Persian in Sarandip and Tamil Nadu: A Study of the contributions of Sri Lanka and Tamil Nadu to Arabic, Arwi, Persian and Urdū Languages, Literature and Education.* Madras: Imamul Arus Trust for the Ministry for Muslim Religious and Cultural Affairs, Colombo, Sri Lanka.

Anand, Sushila. 1996. *Indian Sahib: Queen Victoria's Dear Abdul.* London: Duckworth.

Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London Verso (revised edition) 1991.

Andrews, Walter G. and Kalpakli, Mehmet. 2005. *The Age of Beloveds: Love and the Beloved in Early-Modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society.* Durban and London: Duke University Press.

Ansari, Nishat. 1996. 'Urdu in Jammu and Kashmir'. In Pushp and Warikoo 1996: 165–174.

Arnot, Sandfort and Forbes, Duncan. 1828. *An Essay on the Origin and Structure of the Hindoostanee Tongue, or General Language of British India, with an Account of the Principal Elementary Works on the Subject.* London: Oriental Institution.

Bailey, Grahame. 1932. *A History of Urdu Literature.* Calcutta: Association Press & London: Oxford University Press.

Bailey, Richard W. 1992. *Images of English: A Cultural History of the Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barz, Richard K and Siegel, Jeff. 1988. *Language Transplanted: The Development of Overseas Hindi.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Bawa, V.K. 1992. *The Last Nizam: The Life and Times of Mir Osman Ali Khan.* New Delhi: Penguin Books India.

Bayly, C.A. 1996. *Empire and Information: Intelligence Gathering and Social Communication in India, 1780–1870.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beal, Joan C., Carmela Nocera and Massimo Sturiale (eds.). 2008. *Perspectives on Prescriptivism.* Bern: Peter Lang.

Beames, John. 1866. 'Outlines of a Plea for the Arabic Element in Official Hindustani', *Journal of the Asiatic Society of the Bengal.* Vol. XXXV: No. 1: 1–13.

Beames, John. 1961. *Memoirs of a Bengal Civilian.* London: Chatto and Windus.

Behera, Navnita Chadha. 2000. *State, Identity and Violence: Jammu Kashmir and Ladakh.* New Delhi: Centre for Policy Research.

Behl, Aditya and Weightman, Simon with Shyam Manohar Pandey. 2000. *Mir Sayyid Manjhan Shattari Rajgiri, Madhumalati: An Indian Sufi Romance*, trans. with introduction by Behl et al. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bhatia, Tej K. and Kazuhiko Machida. 2008. *The Oldest [European] Grammar of Hindustani: Language, Contact and Colonial Legacy.* Tokyo: Tokyo University. 3 Vols.

Bhatia, Tej K. and Baumgardner, Robert J. 2008. 'Language in Media and Advertising'. In Kachru et al. 2008: 377–394.

Bhatia, Vijay K. and Sharma, Rajesh. 2008. 'Language and the Legal System'. In Kachru et al. 2008: 361–376.

Bhatnagar, Ram Ratan. 1947. *The Rise and Growth of Hindi Journalism*, Dhirendranath Singh (ed.).Varanasi: Vishwavidyalaya Prakashan, 2003 ed.

Bhimani, Harish. 1995. *In Search of Lata Mangeshkar.* New Delhi: Indus, an Imprint of Harper Collins Publishers India (Pvt.) Ltd.

Bloch, Ivan. 1958. *Sexual Life in England.* London: Corgi Edition, 1965.

Blochmann, Henry Ferdinand (trans.). 1873. *Abul Fazl Aīn-i-Akbarī.* Trans. From Persian into English. Calcutta: Printed for the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1927.

Bouhdiba, Abdelwahab. 1975. *Sexuality in Islam.* Trans. from French by Alan Sheridan. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, English edn. 1985.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1982. *Language and Symbolic Power.* Trans. From the French by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Edited and Introduced by John B. Thompson. Edition used Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992.

Brass, Paul R. 1974. *Language, Religion and Politics in North India.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burke, Peter and Porter, Roy (eds.). 1987. *The Social History of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burke, Peter and Porter, Roy (eds.). 1995. *Languages and Jargons: Contributions to a Social History of Language.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Burney, Zahir Ahmad. 1998. 'Urdu'. In Malhotra 1998: 127–130.

Chaghtai, M. Ikram. 2006. 'Dr Aloys Sprenger and the Delhi College'. In Pernau 2006: 105–124.

Chapman, F.R.H. 1907. *How to Learn Hindustani,* London: Crosby Lockwood and Son.

Chatterji, P.C. 1987. *Broadcasting in India.* New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1991 revised edition.

Chatterji, Suniti Kumar. 1926. *The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language.* London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1970. 1st Pub. Calcutta University Press.

Chatterji, Suniti Kumar. 1942. *Indo-Aryan and Hindi.* Eight Lectures Originally Delivered in 1940 before the Gujarat Vernacular Society, Ahmedabad. Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 2nd revised and enlarged edition, 1960.

Chopra, Anupama. 2007. *King of Bollywood Shah Rukh Khan and the Seductive World of Indian Cinema.* New York: Warner Books.

Churchill, Edward. 1975. 'Printed Literature of the Punjabi Muslims 1860–1900'. In *Sources on Punjab History* (eds.) W. Eric Gustafon and Kenneth W. Jones. Delhi: Manohar Book Services.

Cohn, Bernard. 1985. 'The Command of Language and the Language of Command'. In *Subaltern Studies* IV. Delhi: Oxford University press. Paperback reprint, 1994.

Colebrook, H.T. 1808. 'On the Sanscrit and Pracrit Languages', *Asiatic Researches* Vol. 7. 199–231.

Colvin, J.R. 1832. 'Notice of the Peculiar Tenets held by the followers of Syed Ahmad, Taken chiefly from the "*Sirat-úl Mústaqím,*" a principal Treatise of the Sect written by Maulavī Mahomed Ismaīl', *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* No. 11 (November), pp. 479–498.

Corfield, Penelope J. (ed.). 1991. *Language, History and Class.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Da. Ranade, Ashoka. 2006. *Hindi Film Song: Music Beyond Boundaries.* New Delhi and Chicago: Promilla Co., Publishers in association with Bibliophile South Asia.

Dalmia, Vasudha. 1997. *The Nationalization of Hindu Traditions: Bhāratendu Harischandra and Nineteenth-Century Banaras.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Dalrymple, William. 2003. *White Mughals: Love and Betrayal in Eighteenth-century India.* London: Harper-Collins Publishers Ltd.

Dalrymple, William. 2006. *The Last Mughal: The Fall of a Dynasty, Delhi, 1857.* London: Bloomsbury Publishing Pvt.

Das, Sisir Kumar. 1978. *Sahibs and Munshis: An Account of the College of Fort William.* Calcutta: Orion Publications.

De, R.P. 1904. *Hindustani at a Glance.* Calcutta: R.N. Paun & Brothers.

Desai, Anita. 1984. *In Custody.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Desoulieres, Alain. 1995. 'Problems of Teaching Urdu in France as a Mixed Language', *AUS* 10: 183–191.

Dil, Afia. 1993. *Two Traditions of the Bengali Language.* Islamabad: National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research.

Dillard, J.L. 1985. *Toward a Social History of American English.* Berlin: Mouton Publishers.

Din, Zahir ud. 1985. *Development of Urdu Language and Literature in the Jammu Region.* Srinagar: Gulshan Publishers.

Dissanayake, Wimal. 2008. 'Language in Cinema'. In Kachru et al. 2008: 395–406.

Dittmer, Kerrin. 1972. *Die Indischen Muslims and die Hindi-Urdū-Kontroverse in den United Provinces* [German: The Indian Muslims and the Urdu-Hindi controversy in the United Provinces]. Wiesbaden: Otto Harassowitz.

Dwivedi, S.1981. *Hindi on Trial* New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.

Dover, K.J. 1978. *Greek Homosexuality.* New York: Vintage Books Edition, 1980.

Drewery, Mary. 1979. *William Carey: A Biography.* Seven Oaks, Kent: Hodder & Stoughton.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. 1979. *The Printing Press an Agent of Change: Communication and Cultural Transformation in Early-Modern Europe* 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Engelsing, Rolf and Ian Jackson. 2004. 'Approaches to the History of Readers and Reading in Eighteenth-Century Britain', *Historical Journal* 47:4: 1041–54.

Farouqui, Ather (ed.). 2006. *Redefining Urdu Politics in India.* Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Farouqui, Ather. 2006. 'Introduction'. In Farouqui 2006: 1–10.

Farrukhi, Asif Aslam. 1989. 'Images in a Broken Mirror: The Urdu Scene in Bangladesh', *AUS* No. 7: 83–87.

Faruqi, Shamsur Rahman. 2003. 'A Long History of Urdu Literary Culture, Part-I'. In Pollock, Sheldon (ed.). 2003. *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, pp. 805–863.

Fasold, Ralph W. 1984. *The Sociolinguistics of Language.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell. pp. 34–60.

Fellman, Jack. 1974. *The Revival of a Classical Tongue: Eliezer Ben Yehuda and the Modern Hebrew Language.* The Hague: Mouton.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. 'Diglossia', *Word* 15: 325–340.

Fielden, Lionel. 1960. *The Natural Bent* London: Andre Deutsch.

Fisher, Michael H. 2004. *Counterflows to Colonialism: Indian Travellers and Settlers in Britain 1600–1857.* New Delhi: Permanent Block.

Fleming, Laurence (comp). 2004. *Last Children of the Raj: British Children in India 1919–1939* 2 Vols. London: Radcliffe Press.

Forster, E.M. 1924. *A Passage to India.* Oliver Stallybrass (ed.). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1982 reprint.

Foster, William (ed.). 1921. *Early Travels in India 1583–1619.* London: Oxford University Press.

Foster, William. 1906. *The English Factories in India: 1618–1621: A Calendar of Documents in the India Office, British Museum and Public Record Office.* Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

Foster, William. 1908. *The English Factories in India 1622–1623: A Calendar of Documents in the India Office and the British Museum.* Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

Foster, William. 1911. *The English Factories in India: 1634–1636: A Calendar of Documents in the India Office, British Museum and Public Records Office.* Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1976–1984. *The History of Sexuality* 3 volumes. New York: Pantheon

Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–73.* Colin Gordon (ed.). Trans. Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, Kate Soper. New York: Pantheon Books.

Friedman, Yohanan. 1989. *Prophecy Continuous: Aspects of Ahmedi Religious Thought and Its Medieval Background.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gaborieau, Marc. 1993. 'The Transmission of Islamic Reformist Teachings to Rural South Asia: The Lessons of a case study'. In H. Elboudrari (ed.). *Modes de transmission de la culture religieuse en Islam.* Le Caire: Institut Français d' Archéologie Orientale, 1993, pp. 119–157.

Gandhi, J.S. 2002. 'Living with Urdu, Living Without Urdu: An Attempt at a personal Memoir', *AUS* 17: 138–149. Reprinted in Farouqui 2006: 235–248.

Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism.* Oxford: Wiley Blackwell. 2nd ed., 2006.

Ghani, Muhammad Abdul. 1929. *A History of Persian Language and Literature at the Mughal Court Part I – Bābur.* Allahabad: The Indian Press Ltd.

Ghani, Muhammad Abdul. 1930. *A History of Persian Languages and Literature at the Mughal Court Part III – Akbar.* Allahabad: The Indian Press Ltd.

Ghosh, Biswadeep and the Editors of Stardust. 2004. *Hrithik Roshan.* Mumbai: Magna Publishing.

Gilchrist, John Borthwick. 1796. *A Grammar of the Hindoostanee Language.* R.C. Alston Menston (ed.). London: The Scholar Press, 1970.

Green (Lt. Col). 1895. *A Practical Hindustani Grammar* 2 Vols. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

Green, Nile. 2006. *Indian Sufism since the Seventeenth Century: Saints, books and empires in the Muslim Deccan.* London & New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis.

Growse, F.S. 1866. 'Some Objections to the Modern Style of Official Hindustani', *Journal of the Asiatic Society of the Bengal* Vol. XXXV. No. 3; 172–181.

Guha, Ranajit (ed.). 1981–9. *Subaltern Studies* 6 Vols. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Gulzar, G.N. 2003. 'A Song Travels'. In Gulzar and Chatterjee 2003: 279–294.

Gulzar, Govind Nihalani and Chatterjee, Saibal (eds.). 2003 *Encyclopaedia of Hindi Cinema.* New Delhi: Encyclopaedia Britannica (Pvt) Ltd.

Gumperz, John J. and Robert Wilson. 1971. 'Convergence and Creolization: A Case from the Indo-Aryan/Dravidian Border'. In Hymes, Dell (ed.). 1971. *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 151–167.

Gupta, Jyotirindra Das. 1970. *Language Conflict and National Development: Group Politics and National Language.* Berkeley and London: University of California Press.

Gustaffson, Larisa Oldireva. 2008. 'Phonoaesthetic Assessment of Words in 18th-Century Prescriptions and Later'. In Beal, Joan C. et al. 2008: 83–112.

Hadley, George. 1772. *Grammatical Remarks on the Practical and Vulgar Dialect of the Indostan Language Commonly Called Moors.* London: Cadell. 2nd ed. 1774; edition used: 3rd ed. 1784.

Hadley, George. 1784. *Grammatical Remarks on the Practical and Current Dialect of the Jargon of Hindostan with a Vocabulary.* London: Printed for T. Cadell in the Strand.

Hadley, George 1809. *A Compendium Grammar of the current corrupt Dialect of the Jargon of Hindustan (commonly called Moors) with a vocabulary.* London Printed for A.J. Asperne.

Hansen, Kathryn. 1992. *Grounds for Play: The Nautanki Theatre of North India.* Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Harder, Hans (ed.). 2010. *Literature and Nationalist Ideology Writing Histories of Modern Indian Languages.* New Delhi: Social Science Press.

Hartung, Jan-Peter and Reifeld, Helmut (eds.). 2006. *Islamic Education, Diversity and National Identity: Dīnī Madāris in India Post 9/11.* New Delhi: Sage Publication.

Hasan, Mushirul. 2005. *A Moral Reckoning: Muslim Intellectuals in Nineteenth-century Delhi.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Hasan, Mushirul. 2006. 'Maulavi Zaka Ullah: Sharif Culture and Colonial Rule'. In Pernau 2006: 261–298.

Henny, Sender. 1988. *The Kashmiri Pandits: A Study of Cultural Choice in North India.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Hibbert, Christopher. 1978. *The Great Mutiny: India 1857.* London.

Hindley, Reg. 1990. *The Death of the Irish Language.* London and New York: Routledge.

Holm, John. 1988. *Pidgins and Creoles Vol. 1: Theory and Structure.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hunter, W.W. 1871. *The Indian Musalmans: Are they Bound in Conscience to Rebel Against the Queen.* Lahore: Premier Book House, Reprinted from the 1871 edition, 1974.

Hussain, Fatima. 2009. *The War that Wasn't: the Sufi and the Sultan.* New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

Iqbal, Afzal. 1956. *The Life and Work of Jalaluddin Rumi.* Islamabad: Pakistan National Council of the Arts, 1991 edition.

Irvine, Judith T. and Gal, Susan. 2000. *Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation: Regimes of Language.* Paul Kroskrity (ed.) Santa Fe. New Mexico: School of American Research Press, pp. 35–83.

Israel, Samuel. 2000. *Indian Book Publishing 1947–80.* New Delhi: Mosaic Books.

Jalal, Ayesha. 1985. *The Sole Spokesman: Jinnah, the Muslim League and the Demand for Pakistan.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jawed, Ajeet. 1998. *Secular and Nationalist Jinnah.* Edition used: Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Jindal, K.B. 1955. *A History of Hindi Literature.* Delhi Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd, Rev. ed, 1993.

Kabir, Humayun. 2009. 'Replicating the Deobandi Model of Islamic Schooling: the case of a *Qaomi Madrasa* in a district town of Bangladesh', *Contemporary South Asia* Vol. 17: No. 4 (Dec), 415–428.

Kabir, Nasreen Munni. 2009. *Lata Mangeshkar...in her own voice: Conversations with Nasreen Munni Kabir.* New Delhi: Niyogi Books.

Kachru, Braj B., Yamuna Kachru, and S.N. Sridhar (eds.). 2008. *Language in South Asia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, Yamuna. 2008. 'Hindi-Urdu-Hindustani'. In Kachru, B. et al. 2008: 81–102.

Kavoori, Anandam P and Punathambekar, Aswin (eds.). 2008. *Global Bollywood.* New York: New York University, 2008. This ed. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Kaye, John William. 1854. *The Life and Correspondence of Charles, Lord Metcalfe* 2 Vols. London: Richard Bentley.

Kehnel, Annette. 2006. 'Poets, Preachers and Friars Revisited: Fourteenth-Century Multilingual Franciscan Manuscripts'. In Schaefer 2006: 91–114.

Keniston, Kenneth. 1997. 'Software Localization: Notes on Technology and Culture'. Working paper 26, program in Science, Technology, and Society, MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Kesavan, Mukul. 1994. 'Urdu, Awadh and the Tawaif: the Islamicate Roots of Hindi Cinema'. In Hasan, Zoya (ed.) *Forging Identities: Gender, Communities and the State in India* Colorado: Westview Press. Edition used: New Delhi: Kali for Women, pp. 244–257.

Khan, A.D. 1994. *Diplomatics of the Soyurghal Farman of the Great Mughals (1556–1707).* Allahabad: Quemer Publications.

Khan, Abdul Jamil. 2006. *The Politics of Language: Urdū/Hindi An Artificial Divide.* New York: Algora Publishing.

Khan, Seid Ghulam Hossein. 1789. *The Seir Mutaqherin: or Review of Modern Times: Being an History of India as far down as the year 1783 the whole written in Persian.* Trans. into English, by Tota Manus. 4 Vols. Reprinted. Lahore: Sheikh Mubarak Ali, Oriental Publishers and Booksellers, 1975.

Kidwai, Sadiq-ur-Rahman. 1972. *Gilchrist and the language of Hindoostan.* New Delhi.

Kincaid, Dennis. 1938. *British Social Life in India, 1608–1937.* London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973.

King, Christopher R. 1994. *One Language, Two Scripts: The Hindi Movement in Nineteenth Century North India.* Bombay: Oxford University Press.

Kipling, Rudyard. 1896. *Plain Tales from the Hills.* London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd.

Knowles, Gerald. 1979. *A Cultural History of the English Language.* 6th reprinted ed. London & New York: Arnold.

Kuczkiewicz-Fras, Agnieszka. 2003. *Perso-Arabic Hybrids in Hindi: The Socio-linguistic and Structural Analysis.* New Delhi: Manohar.

Kuczkiewicz-Fras, Agnieszka. 2008. *Perso-Arabic Loanwords in Hindustani: Part-I Dictionary.* Kraków: Ksiegarnia Akademicka.

Kuhn, Thomas S. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* 2nd revised ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Kumar, Krishna. 1991. *Political Agenda of Education: A Study of Colonialist and Nationalist Ideas.* New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Kumar, Shanti. 2008. 'Hollywood, Bollywood, Tollywood: Redefining the Global in Indian Cinema'. In Kavoori & Punathambekar 2008: 79–95.

Lal, K.S. 1988. *The Mughal Harem.* New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan.

Leith, Dick. 1983. *A Social History of English.* 2nd. ed. London: Taylor and Francis e-Library, 2005.

Lelyveld, David. 1978. *Aligarh's First Generation: Muslim Solidarity in British India.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press Ed. used Lahore: Book Traders, 1991.

Lelyveld, David. 1993. 'Colonial Knowledge and the fate of Hindustani'. In *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 3; 4: 660–82.

Leonard, Karen. 1978. 'Hyderabad: The Mulki-Non-Mulki Conflict'. In R. Jeffrey (ed.), *People, Princes and Paramount Power: Society and Politics in the Indian Princely States,* pp. 65–106.

Lewis, Ivor. 1991. *Sahibs, Nabobs and Boxwallahs: A Dictionary of the Words of Anglo-India.* Bombay: Oxford University Press.

Lodge, Anthony R. 1993. *French: From Dialect to Standard.* London and New York: Routledge.

Majeed, Javed. 1995. '"The Jargon of Indostan' An Exploration of Jargon in Urdu and East India Company English'. In Burke & Porter 1995: 182–205.

Malhotra, D.N. 1998a. 'A Giant in Slumbers'. In Malhotra 1998: 10–22.

Malhotra, D.N. 1998. *50 Years of Book Publishing in India Since Independence.* New Delhi: Federation of Indian Publishers.

Malik, Amita. 2003. 'The Golden Age: 1947–1961'. In Gulzar & Chatterjee 2003: 61–74.

Malik, H. 1980. *Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan and Muslim Modernization in India.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Marek, Jan. 1995. 'The Teaching of Urdu in a Small European Country (Czech Republic)', *AUS* 10: 192–197.

Masood, Ross. 1924. *National Education, a Bold Experiment at Osmania University.* Reprint edition. Islamabad: NLA, 1987.

Matthews, D.J. 1991. 'The Kulliyāt of Muhammad Qulī Qutb Shāh: Problems and Prospects'. In Shackle 1991: 39–48.

Mc Gregor, Ronald Stuart. 1984. *Hindi Literature From Its Beginnings to the Nineteenth Century.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Mc Luhan, Marshall. 1962. *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man.* London.

McIntosh, Mary. 1968. "The Homosexual Role", *Social Problems* 16:2 (Autumn), 182–192.

Metcalf, Barbara D. (ed.). 1984. *Moral Conduct and Authority: The Place of Adab in South Asian Islam.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Metcalf, Barbara D. 1982. *Islamic Revival in British India: Deoband, 1860–1900.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Metcalf, Barbara D. 1991. 'Maulānā Ashraf Alī Thānavī and Urdu Literature'. In Shackle 1991: 93–100.

Milroy, Jim. 2002. 'The Legitimate Language: Giving a History to English'. In Watts, Richard and Peter Trudgill (eds.). 2002. *Alternative Histories of English.* London: Routledge.

Minault, Gail. 1974. 'Urdu Political Poetry during the Khilafat Movement', *Modern Asian Studies* 8: 4; 459–471.

Minault, Gail. 1998. *Secluded Scholars: Women's Education and Muslim Social Reform in Colonial India.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Mir, Ali Husain and Mir, Raza. 2006. *Anthems of Resistance: A Celebration of Progressive Urdū Poetry.* New Delhi: India Link Roli Books.

Mohiuddin, Momin. 1971. *The Chancellery and Persian Epistolography under the Mughals: From Babur to Shah Jahan (1526–1658).* Calcutta: Iran Society.

Nadvi, Mohammad Akram. 2007. *Madrasah Life: A Student's Day at Nadwat ul-Ulama.* London: Turath Publishing.

Naim, C.M. 1979. 'The Theme of Homosexual (Pederastic) Love in pre-Modern Urdu Poetry; In M. Umar Memon (ed.), *Studies in the Urdū Ghazal and Prose Fiction.* Madison: University of Wisconsin, pp. 120–142.

Naim, C.M. 1984. 'Prize-Winning *Adab*: A Study of Five Books Written in Response to the Allahabad Gazette Notification'. In Metcalf 1984.

Naim, C.M. 1987. 'How Bibi Ashraf Learned to Write and Write', *AUS* 6: 99–115.

Naim, C.M. 1991. 'Poet-audience Interaction at Urdu Musha'iras'. In Shackle 1991: 167–173.

Naim, C.M. 2006. 'Shaikh Imam Bakhsh Sahba'i: Teacher, Scholar, Poet, and Puzzle-master'. In Pernau 2006: 145–185.

Naim, C.M. 2001. 'Transvestic Words?: The *Rekhti* in Urdu', *AUS*: 16 (2001), 3–26.

Najmabadi, Afsaneh. 2005. *Women with Moustaches and Men without Beards: Gender and Sexual Anxieties of Iranian Modernity.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nasr, Seyyed Vali Reza. 1994. *The Vanguard of the Islamic Revolution: The Jama'at-i-Islami of Pakistan.* London: I.B. Tauris Publishers.

Nizami, Khaliq Ahmad. 2007. *The Life and Times of Shaikh Nizam-Ud-Din Auliya.* New Delhi; Oxford University Press.

NLA. 2005b. *Electronic Dictionary of Localization of Computer Applications (English-Urdu).* Islamabad: NLA.

Oesterheld, Christina. 2002. 'Problems of Teaching Urdu in Germany: A Foreigner's Reflections on the Status of Urdu', *AUS* No. 17: 125–137.

Oesterheld, Christina. 2006. 'Deputy Nazir Ahmad and the Delhi College'. In Pernau 2006: 299–324.

Ogborn, Miles. 2007. *Indian Ink.* Chicago: the University of Chicago Press.

Ong, Walter J. 1982. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word.* London and New York: Routledge.

Orsini, Francesca. 2002. *The Hindi Public Sphere 1920–1940: Language and Literature in the Age of Nationalism.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Ostler, Nicholas. 2005. *Empires of the Word: A Language History of the World.* New York: Harper-Collins.

Ostler, Nicholas. 2007. *Ad Infinitum: A Biography of Latin.* New York: Walker and Company.

Pachauri, S.K. 1993. *Archives: Rare Papers of Historic Importance—Occasional Papers, Series No. 1.* Hyderabad: Andhra Pradesh State Archives and Research Institute.

Parkes, Fanny. 1850. *Wanderings of a Pilgrim in Search of the Picturesque, during four-and-twenty years in the East: with Revelations of Life in the Zenana.* London: John Richardson. Edition cited, Dalrymple, William (ed. and introduced). 2003. *Begums, Thugs and Englishmen: The Journals of Fanny Parkes.* New Delhi: Penguin Books.

Parsons, John (comp). 1875. *The Hindustani Choral Book or Swar Sangrah.* Benares: Printed and Published by E.J. Lazarus and Co. at the Medical Hall Press.

Pearce, Robert Rouiere. 1846. *Memoirs and Correspondence of the Most Noble Richard Marquess Wellesley* 3 Vols. London: Richard Bentley, New Burlington St.

Pearson, Harlan O. 2008. *Islamic Reform and Revival in Nineteenth Century India: the Tarīqāh-i-Muhammadīyā.* New Delhi: Yoda Press.

Pemberton, Kelly. 2006. 'Whither Urdu? Language, Community and Power in India Today'. In Farouqui 2006: 141–161.

Pemble, John (ed.). 1985. *Miss Fane in India.* Gloucester: Alan Sutton.

Pernau, Margarit (ed.). 2006. *The Delhi College: Traditional Elites, the Colonial State, and Education before 1857.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Petievich, Carla. 2001. 'Gender Politics and the Urdu ghazal: Exploratory observations on *Rekhta* versus *Rekhti', The Indian Economic and Social History Review* 38: 3 (2001), 223–248.

Petievich, Carla. 2007. *When Men speak as Women: Vocal Masquerade in Indo-Muslim Poetry.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Phillott, D.C. 1911. *Urdū Rozmarra or 'Every-day Urdū'.* Calcutta: Printed at the Baptist Mission Press.

Phillott, D.C. 1913. *Hindustani Manual.* Calcutta: Published by the Author.

Pincott, Frederic. 1882. *Tarjuma-i Alif Laila Ba-Zubán-i-Urdū (Do Jild Ba- Harfát-i-Yúrop)* Romanized under the superintendence of T.W.H. Tolbort and edited by F. Pincott. London: W.H. Allen & Co.

Pinder-Wilson, R. (ed.) 1969. *Paintings from Islamic Lands: Oriental Studies IV.* Oxford: Bruno Cassirer.

Platts, John T. 1884. *A Dictionary of Urdu, Classical Hindi, and English.* Lahore: Sang-e-Meel, 1983.

Platts, John T. 1920. *A Grammar of the Hindustani or Urdū Language.* London: Oxford University Press.

Plummer, Kenneth (ed.). 1981. *The Making of the Modern Homosexual.* London: Hutchinson.

Pollock, Sheldon. 2006. *The Language of the Gods in World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India.* Delhi: Permanent Black, 2007.

Powell, Avril A. 2006. 'Scholar Manque or Mere Munshi?. In Pernau 2006: 203–231.

Powell, Avril A. 1993. *Muslims and Missionaries in Pre-Mutiny India.* Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press.

Prasad, Babu Siva. 1868. *Our Vernaculars: A Lecture Before the Benares Institute.* Benares: Printed at the Medical Hall Press.

Pritchett, Frances in association with Faruqi, Shamsur Rahman (trans. & ed.). 2001. *Ab-e-Hayat: shaping the Canon of Urdū Poetry by Muhammad Husain Azad.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Pritchett, Frances W. 1994. *Nets of Awareness: Urdū Poetry and Its Critics.* Edition used: Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Purchas, Samuel. 1905. *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrims* Vol. IX. Glasgow: Mac Lehose and Sons, Publishers to the University, MCMV.

Pushp, P.N. and Warikoo, K. (eds.). 1996. *Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh: Linguistic Predicament.* New Delhi: Har-Anand Publications.

Pushp, P.N. 1996. 'Kashmiri and the Linguistic Predicament of the State'. In Pushp and Warikoo 1996: 1–29.

Qureshi, Naeem. 1999. *Pan-Islam in British India: The Politics of the Khilafat Movement 1918–1924.* E.J. Brill. This edition Karachi: Oxford University Press 2009.

Rabin, Chaim. 1973. *A Short History of the Hebrew Language.* Jerusalem: The Jewish Agency.

Rahman, Tariq. 2010. 'Language on Wheels: Inscriptions on Pakistani Trucks as a Window into Popular Worldview'. In Rahman, Tariq. 2010. *Language Policy, Identity, and Religion: Aspects of the Civilization of the Muslims of Pakistan and North India.* Islamabad: Chair on Quaid-i-Azam & Freedom Movement, National Institute of Pakistan Studies, Quaid-i-Azam University, pp. 256–303.

Rahman, Tariq. 1988. 'Ephebophilia: The Case for the Use of a New Word', *Forum for Modern Language Studies* Vol. 24; No. 2 (April), 126–141.

Rahman, Tariq. 1990. 'Boy-love in the Urdu Ghazal', *AUS* 7: 1–20.

Rahman, Tariq. 1996. *Language and Politics in Pakistan.* Karachi: Oxford University Press. Edition used: Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 2007.

Rahman, Tariq. 1999. *Language, Education and Culture.* Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Rahman, Tariq. 2002a. 'The Language of the Salariat'. In Naseem, S.M. and Nadvi, Khalid (eds.). 2002. *The Post-Colonial State and Social Transformation in India and Pakistan.* Karachi: Oxford University Press, pp. 97–128.

Rahman, Tariq. 2004. *Denizens of Alien Worlds: A Study of Education, Inequality and Polarization in Pakistan.* Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Rahman, Tariq. 2008b. '*Munāzarah* literature in Urdu: an Extra-Curricular Educational Input in Pakistan's religious Education', *Islamic Studies* Vol. 47: No. 2 (Summer), 197–220.

Rahman, Tariq. 2008c. 'The First Book of Old Urdu in the Pashto-Speaking Areas', *Pakistan Journal of History of Culture* Vol. 29. No. 2 (July–December), 153–165.

Rahman, Tariq. 2009. 'The Events of 1857 in Contemporary Writings in Urdu', *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* Vol. 32 No. 2 (August) 212–229.

Rahman. Tariq. 2002. *Language, Ideology and Power: Language-Learning Among the Muslims of Pakistan and North India.* Karachi: Oxford University Press. Edition used: Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 2008.

Rai, Alok. 2001. *Hindi Nationalism.* Delhi: Orient Longman.

Rai, Amrit. 1984. *A House Divided: the Origin and Development of Hindi/Hindavi.* Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Rai, Miridu. 2004. *Hindu Rulers, Muslim Subjects: Islam, Rights, and the History of Kashmir.* London: Hurst and Coy. Also New Delhi: Permanent Black.

Rashid. Ahmed. 2000. *Taliban: Islam, Oil and the New Great Game in Central Asia.* London: I.B. Tauris.

Rizvi, Abbas. 1982. *Shah Abd al-Aziz: Puritanism, Sectarian Polemics and Jihad.* Australia: Ma'rifat Publishing House.

Robinson, Francis. 1996. 'Islam and the Impact of Print in South Asia'. In Nigel Crook (ed.). 1996. *The Transmission of Knowledge in South Asia.* Delhi: Oxford University Press, 62–97.

Robinson, Francis. 2002. *The Ulema of Farangī Mahal and Islamic Culture in South Asia.* Lahore: Ferozesons.

Roebuck, Thomas (comp). 1819. *The Annals of the College of Fort William.* Calcutta: Printed by Philip Pereira, at the Hindoostanee Press.

Russell, Ralph (ed.). 1982. *Urdū in Britain: A Report on The first and Second National Urdū Conferences, 1979 and 1981.* London: Urdu Markaz.

Russell, Ralph. 1979. 'Ethnic Minority Languages and the Schools, with Special Reference to Urdu'. In Russell 1982: 19–47.

Russell, Ralph. 1996. 'Urdu & I', *AUS* No. 11: 5–70.

Sadiq, Muhammad. 1964. *A History of Urdu Literature.* Karachi: Oxford University Press, rev. ed. 1985.

Sajanlal, K. 1974. "The Mulkis and Non-Mulkis Question Under Salar Jang Regime—His Arzdashts and Ahkams of Asaf Jah VI." *Itihās: Journal of the Andhra Pradesh Archives* 2(1):129–45.

Saksena, Ram Babu. 1927. *A History of Urdū Literature.* Lahore: Sind Sagar Academy, 1975.

Salter, Joseph. 1873. *Asiatic in England: Sketches of Sixteen Years Work Among Orientals.* London: Seely, Jackson, and Halliday.

Sanyal, Usha. 1996. *Devotional Islam and Politics in British India: Ahmad Riza Khan Barelvi and his Movement, 1870–1920.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Schaefer, Ursula (ed.). 2006. *The Beginnings of Standardization: Language and Culture in Fourteenth-Century England.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Schieffelin, Bambi, Kathryin Woolard, and Paul Krosktiry (eds.). 1998. *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Sekhon, Sant Singh and Duggal, Kartar Singh. 1992. *A History of Punjabi Literature.* Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.

Shackle, Christopher (ed.). 1991. *Urdu and Muslim South Asia: Studies in the Honour of Ralph Russell.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Shackle, Christopher. 1991. 'Urdu as a Sideline: the Poetry of Khwaja Ghulam Farid'. In Shackle 1991: 77–91.

Shah, I.A. 1918. *The Briton in India.* London: Leopold B. Hill.

Shakespear, John. 1840. *Muntakhabat-i-Hindi or Selections in Hindustani* 4th ed. Vol. 1. London: Printed for the Author.

Sharma, Sunil. 2006. *Amir Khusraw: the Poet of Sultans and Sufis.* Oxford: Oneworld Publications.

Siddiqi, M. Atique. 1963. *Origins of Modern Hindustani Literature: Source Material: Gilchrist Letters.* Aligarh: Naya Kitab Ghar.

Silverstein, Michael. 1998. 'The Uses and Utility of Ideology: A Commentary'. In Schieffelin, B et al.: 123–145.

Singh, Inderpal. n.d. *A Critical Assessment of the Teaching of Punjabi in the Punjab State at the School Stage.* Ludhiana: Lahore Book Shop.

Singh, Jaswant. 2009. *Jinnah: India–Pakistan–Independence.* Delhi: Rupa & Co.

Sinha, Narendra Krishna and Dasgupta, Arun Kumar (eds.). 1964. *Selections from Ochterlony Papers 1818–1825.* Calcutta: University of Calcutta

Spolsky, Bernard and Shohamy, Elena. 1999. *The Languages of Israel: Policy, Ideology and Practice.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Sprenger, A. 1852. 'Has Sa'dy of Shyraz Written Rékhtah Verses?', *Journal of the Asiatic Society* No. VI: 513–519.

Stark, Ulrike. 2008. *An Empire of Books: The Naval Kishore Press and the Diffusion of the Printed Word in Colonial India* Delhi: Permanent Black.

Steadman-Jones, Richard. 2007. *Colonialism and Grammatical Representation: John Gilchrist and the Analysis of the 'Hindustani' Language in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Subramanyam, K. 1991. "The Press in Andhra and the Princely State 1920–1930." *Itihas: Journal of the Andhra Pradesh Archives* 17(1):83–100.

Suvorova, Anna A. 2000. *Masnavi: A Study of Urdū Romance.* Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Suvorova, Anna. 2009. *Early Urdū Theatre: Traditions and Transformations.* Lahore: National College of Arts.

Taj, Afroz. 2007. *The Court of Indar: And the Rebirth of North Indian Drama.* India: Anjuman Taraqqi Urdu (Hind).

Temple, Richard. 1893. *James Thamason.* Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

Teng, Mohan Krishen, Ram Krishen Bhatt, and Santosh Kaul (comp.). 1977. *Kashmir: Constitutional History and Documents.* New Delhi: Light and Life Publishers.

Thompson, Edward Palmer. 1963. *The Making of the English Working Class.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Thussu, Daya Kishan. 2008. 'The Globalization of "Bollywood"'. In Kavoori & Punathambekar 2008: 97–113.

Trevelyan, George Macaulay. 1942. *English Social History: A Survey of Six Centuries from Chaucer to Queen Victoria.* London: Longmans, Green and Co.

Trivedi, Harish. 2006. 'All kinds of Hindi. The Evolving Language of Hindi Cinema'. In Lal, Vinay and Nandy, Ashis (eds.). 2006. *Fingerprinting Popular Culture: The Mythic and the Iconic in Indian Cinema.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press. pp. 51–86.

Tschacher, Torsten. 2001. *Islam in Tamilnadu: Varia* Halle (Salle): Institute für Indologue and südasien wissenschaften der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg.

Tschacher, Torsten. 2006. 'Islamic education in a Tamil Town: The Case of Kilakkarai'. In Hartung and Reifeld 2006: 196–223.

Umar, Badruddin. 2004. *The Emergence of Bangladesh: Class Struggles in East Pakistan (1947–1958).* Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Vanita, Ruth and Kidwai, Saleem. 2000. *Same-sex Love in India: Readings from Literature and History.* New York: St. Martins' Press.

Vanita, Ruth. 2004. 'Married among Their Companions: Female Homoerotic Relations in Nineteenth-Century Urdu *Rēkhtī* poetry in India', *Journal of Women's History* Vol. 16: No. 1: pp. 12–52.

Vaudeville, Charlotte. 1993. *A Weaver Named Kabir: Selected Verses with a Detailed Biographical and Historical Introduction.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Vedalankar, Shardadevi. 1969. *The Development of Hindi Prose Literature in the Early Nineteenth Century* (1800–1856 AD). Allahabad: Lokbharti Publications, 1969.

Viswanathan, Gauri. 1989. *Masks of Conquest* New York: Columbia. This edition: London: Faber and Faber, 1990.

Warikoo, K. 1996. 'Language and Politics in Jammu and Kashmir: Issues and Perspectives'. In Pushp & Warikoo 1996: 183–212.

Wassink, Alicia and Dyer, Judy. 2004. 'Language Ideology and the Transmission of Phonological Change: Changing Indexicality in two Situations of Language Contact', *Journal of English Linguistics* 32: 3–30.

Williams, Monier. 1871. *A Practical Hindustani Grammar.* London: Longmans, Green and Co.

Winkelmann, Marieke Jule. 2006. 'Muslim reaction to the Post–9/11 Media Discourse on the Indian *Madaris*'. In Hartung & Reifeld 2006: 252–268.

Woolard, Kathryn A. 1998. 'Introduction: Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry: Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory'. In Schieffelin, B. et al. 1998: 3–47.

Yule, Henry and Burnell, A.C. 1903. *Hobson-Jobson: A Glossary of Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases, and of Kindred Terms, Etymological, Historical, Geographical and Discursive.* New edition by Wiliam Crooke (ed.). Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd, 1994.

Zaidi, Ali Jawad. 1993. *A History of Urdū Literature.* Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.

Zaidi, Hasan. 2010. 'The Alternative is Mainstream', *The Herald* (August 2010).

Zaidi, Mujahid Husain. 1973. *Urdu-Handschriften.* Weisbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH.

Zubrzycki, John. 2006. *The Last Nizam: The Rise and Fall of India's Greatest Princely State.* London: Pan Macmillan Australia, Ltd.

Zutshi, Chitralekha. 2004. *Languages of Belonging: Islam, Regional Identity, and the Making of Kashmir.* London: Hurst and Company.

SECTION–5

Interviews, Websites, Personal Communication & Internet Sites

Akhtar. Javed. 2007. 'Telephone Interview with Javed Akhtar'. Islamabad to Mumbai. 13 March.

Anzar, Uzma. 2003. *Islamic Education: A Brief History of Madrasas with Comments on Curricula and Current Pedagogical Practices.* http://site sources.worldbank.org/ EDUCATION. Accessed on 29 August 2010.

Arif, Iftikhar. 2009. 'Interview with a famous Radio and TV personality'. Islamabad, 12 July.

Azhar, Aslam. 2006. 'Interview with the Director PTV from 1972–77', Islamabad, 20 October.

Cinema Website. 2010. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/cinema_of Pakistan. Accessed on 15 August 2010.

Durrani, Asad. 2010. 'Personal Communication from Lt. General (Retd.) Asad Durrani'. Ex-Director General Military Training, Islamabad. 3 August.

Durrani, Atash. 2003. 'Interview of Dr Atash Durrani'. 14 November. NLA, Islamabad.

Ghazala. 2007. 'Interview with Ghazala Nargis'. Mumbai, 5 March.

Gondal, Ashfaq Ahmad. 2009. 'Interview of Mr Ashfaq Ahmad Gondal, Former Federal Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting till 2009'. 12 December. Islamabad.

Gordon, Raymond (ed.). 2005. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World.* 15th ed. Dallas, Texas: SIL International Online. Accessed on 19 July 2010. http://www. ethnologue. com/ show_language.asp?code=ard.

Gulzar. 2007. 'Telephone Interview with Gulzar'. [Sampuran Singh] Mumbai. 7 March.

Hussain Sarmad. 2004. 'Interview of Dr Sarmad Hussain'. Karachi, 3 January.

Izhar. 2010. *Izhār ul Haq* in http://darulislam.info/index.php? Accessed on 22 August.

Kamdar, Paresh. 2007. 'Interview with Paresh Kamdar'. Mumbai. 5 March.

Kermani, Sheema. 2009. 'Personal Communication by e-mail'. 6 August.

Mannan, Abdul and Mannan, Farzana. 2010. 'Quomi Madrasa: Time to Remove the Stigma'. http://www.thedailystar.net/supplements/2010/03/26th arch/ page//.html. Accessed on 29 August 2010.

MANUU. n.d. Maulana Azad National Urdu University (Hyderabad). http:// manuu.ac.in/aboutus.html. Accessed 16 March 2008).

Nasir, Agha. 2006. 'Interview with Agha Nasir for me Radio Personality MD TV'. Islamabad. 18 October.

Patwardan, Gauri. 2007. 'Interview with Gauri Patwardan'. Mumbai. 4 March.

PEMRA. 2010. http://pemra.gov.pk/satellite_tv.html. Accessed on 16 August.

Siddiqui, Javed. 2007. 'Telephone Interview with Javed Siddiqui'. Mumbai. 7 March.

Zaheer, Nadira. 2007. 'Telephone Interview with Nadira Zaheer. Mumbai. 7 March.

Index